COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME VIII.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
THE LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN.
1888.

INDEX TO VOLUME VIII.

No. 1.

The Necessity of Good Works, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 1

Protestant Church Problems in Germany, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 24

The Doctrine of Creation, translated by Rev. L. H. Schuh..... 35

Transformism, by Prof. A. Pflueger..... 57

The Indebtedness of the German Language to Luther, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 60

No. 2.

The Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 65

The Jesuits, by Prof. G. H. Schodde..... 97

Hermeneutical Principles, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 107

Infant Baptism, translated by Prof. A. Pflueger..... 122

No. 3.

The Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 129

Recent Research in Bible Lands, by Prof. G. H. Schodde..... 157

Home Mission on Sunday, translated by J. H. Kuhlmann..... 168

No. 4.

Hermeneutical Principles, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 193
The Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 213
The Position and Task of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, etc. translated by Rev. J. H. Schneider..... 226

No. 5.

Hermeneutical Principles, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 265
The Church Council, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 280
Life Insurance, by Prof. A. Pflueger 296
The Relation of Good Works to Justification, translated by Rev. L. H. Schuh..... 317

No. 6.

Discipline Commended, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 329
Conscience, by Prof. J. M. Hantz 344
An Essay on Baptism, based on Romans 6, 3-4, by Rev. S. Schillinger 360
The Errors of Judaism in Christ's Day..... 381

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VIII. FEBRUARY, 1888. No. 1.

THE NECESSITY OF GOOD WORKS.

In this age of extraordinary activity no subject is more likely to receive an attentive hearing than that of good works. Their necessity is not only admitted on all sides, but they are urged with a zealous persistence and a vehement emphasis that gives them great prominence in the teaching of our time. But herein lies a danger to which Christians must not close their eyes. While too much cannot be done for the glory of our Redeemer, such stress may be laid upon the doing and such importance may be attached to the work done as to vitiate the whole, and at last bring dishonor upon His blessed name. It seems to us needful to lift up a voice of warning, and to cry aloud: Beware of the leaven of Romanism! If in our zeal for the work of missions and of mercy we permit Satan toinstil into the hearts of men the fatal error of salvation by works, leaving us a religion without a Savior, all labor is lost and all the noise about the glorious activity and the unparalleled abundance of good works characterizing our age is sheer Pharisaism. And the fact that in so many churches there is not only a disinclination to give attention to doctrine, but a certain contempt for all efforts to explain and enforce it, while the opinion underlying it all is not unseldom uttered, that if

people will only work in the church, it matters little what they believe, and this other fact, that in all the churches there is a strong tendency to ignore differences in faith for the sake of forming a stronger union in works, should put the watchmen on their guard, lest the enemy accomplish his deadly purpose, whilst they, professing to be too busy in good works to give attention to questions of doctrine and faith, neglect the main business of the Master.

There is no lack of light in regard to the doctrine of good works. The Scriptures contain ample instruction on the subject in all its phases, and in the searching days of the Reformation their teaching was set forth so fully and so clearly that the churches have no excuse for pursuing dangerous paths. It will be the part of wisdom if they return to the old way and humbly walk in it.

That good works are necessary is unquestionable. Those who charged Lutherans with disparaging and discouraging them either knew not what they said or maliciously bore false witness against the Church of the Reformation. Rome never understood the Gospel of the grace of God in Christ, and therefore never could understand the evangelical confession which denied a place to good works in the article of justification and salvation. Under the circumstances it was natural that Romanists should bring wailing accusations against the Lutherans touching this point. And of many who call themselves Protestants we are constrained to make the same remark. They falsely charge us with opposing good works because they have not heartily and fully embraced the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith alone. But whatever may be the reason for making them, the charges were made in Luther's time, and are repeated still when the doctrine is set forth in its scriptural purity and simplicity

and they were in conflict with the fact then and are so now. "Ours are falsely accused of forbidding good works," says the Augsburg Confession. "For their writings extant upon the Ten Commandments, and others of the like argument, do bear witness, what they have to good purpose taught concerning every kind of life and its duties; what kinds of life and what works in every calling do please God. Of which things preachers in former times taught little or nothing: only they urged certain childish and needless works, as, keeping of birthdays, set fasts, fraternities, pilgrimages, worshiping of saints, the use of rosaries, monkery, and such like things." *A. C. Art.* 20, § 1–3. To the Lutheran Reformation belongs the credit of bringing again to the light not only the way of salvation through faith in Christ, but also the way of glorifying the Savior through good works.

Of the new obedience our churches "teach that this faith should bring forth good fruits, and that men ought to do the good works commanded of God, because it is God's will, and not on any confidence of meriting justification before God by their works." *Augsb. Conf. Art.* 6. Good works are necessary, but they are not necessary to salvation.

"There is no controversy among our theologians concerning the following points in this article; namely, that it is God's will, regulation, and command that believers should walk in good works; and that truly good works are not those which every one, with a good intention, himself contrives, or which are done according to human ordinances, but those which God Himself has prescribed and commanded in His Word. Also, that truly good works are done, not from our own natural powers, but when by faith the person is reconciled with God and renewed by the Holy Ghost, or, as St. Paul says, 'created anew in Christ Jesus to good works,'

Ehp. 2, 10. There is also no controversy as to how and for what reason the good works of believers, although, in this flesh, they are impure and incomplete, please God and are acceptable; namely, for the sake of the Lord Christ, by faith, because the person is acceptable to God. For the works which pertain to the maintenance of external discipline, which are done also by the unbelieving and unconverted, and required of them, although commendable before the world, and besides rewarded by God in this world with temporal possessions; yet, because they do not proceed from true faith, are in God's sight sins, i. e. stained with sin, and are regarded by God as sins and impure on account of the corrupt nature and because the person is not reconciled with God. For a 'corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit,' (Matt. 7, 18), as also it is written (Rom. 14, 23): 'For whatsoever is not of faith is sin.' For the person must first be accepted of God, and that alone for the sake of Christ, if the works of that person are to please Him. Therefore of works that are truly good and well pleasing to God, which God will reward in this world and the world to come, faith must be the mother and source; and on this account they are called by St. Paul true 'fruits of faith,' as also 'of the Spirit.'" *Form. Conc. P.* II. *chap.* 4, § 7–9.

In considering the somewhat complicated question arising in connection with good works it is important to keep these lucid distinctions in mind.

First, man was created in the image of God in righteousness and true holiness. He was good. That was as God would have him be. When sin entered into the world the will of God was not changed. His requirement is still the same, "Be ye holy, for I am holy." Man missed his destiny when he departed from God and became His enemy by

wicked works, and he remains a failure among creatures until he returns to good and quits himself like a man by the power of the Holy Spirit. The purpose of the Creator is not attained in men until they become holy and abound in good works. "This is the will of God, even your sanctification." 1 Thess. 4, 3. Hence this is mentioned also as an object in the redemption of the human race. Our Lord Jesus "gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Tit. 2, 14. "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2, 10. The will and order of God from the beginning was that man should be holy and live in a state of good works. Hence the restoration of man to his original state is to Christians a matter of daily prayer, according to the apostle's exhortation, "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. 4, 23. 24.

Secondly, not all works are good that man may please to dignify with that epithet. Not even all that are done with good intentions are therefore good works. Man never was an independent being who could choose his own path and determine what is good by his own will. When he departs from the rule of His Maker, his way and work are evil, whatever may be his own view or feeling in the matter. God alone is Lord. He wills that we should do good works, and His will alone determines what works are good. Keeping fasts, going on pilgrimages, worship and work in secret societies, union meetings with errorists, anxious bench excitements, worshiping saints, and similar devices and ordinances of men may seem good and may be practiced with

good intentions, but God has not commanded them, and it is a grievous sin to bind them on men's consciences. There is none good but God, and there are no good works but those which He has commanded. Others may be adjudged by human reason to be expedient, but they are not such as are required by the will and order of God, and are not necessary.

Thirdly, good works do not proceed from our sinful nature and cannot be done by our natural powers, but necessarily presuppose a person reconciled and pleasing to God, so that faith is their "mother and source." There are several points of fundamental import embraced in this proposition.

One is that the natural condition of man is such that he can do no good work. The corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. He may outwardly perform what the law prescribes, but his heart is not in accord with the will of Him who gave the law and with His purpose in giving it. Hence the work of the law performed by such a person is not a good work and is not pleasing to God, who is not deceived by outward appearances.

A second point is that faith is the necessary antecedent and condition of all good works. The reason for maintaining this is, that only when faith is wrought in the soul does the Holy Spirit direct it and lead it to righteousness of purpose and act. As long as this faith is wanting, the human mind, though it may have moral desires and ends, has no power but that of nature, and can accomplish nothing but sin, even though the sin appear in the guise of virtue. No man is actuated by the Spirit of holiness so long as he resists the work of the Holy Spirit; and the first product of this work is faith in the Redeemer of the world. Only when this is wrought does the Spirit dwell in the heart and control its action. "As many as received Him, to them

gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which are born, not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John 1, 12. 13. And only thus is the soul in a condition to make good works possible. For how can we love God as long as He stands over against us with legal claims that seem to our reason tyrannical, because they demand what we cannot render? Only when God is believed to be reconciled through Christ and presents Himself to us as our loving Father, not as our stern Judge, can we love Him and delight to do His will. "We love Him because He first loved us." 1 John 4, 19. There is no power and there is no motive for good works in the sinner as long as he is not a believer in Jesus. The heart is purified by faith. Acts 15, 9. Accordingly our Confession declares: "Because indeed faith brings the Holy Ghost and produces in hearts a new life, it is necessary that it should produce spiritual movements into hearts. And what these movements are the prophet shows, when he says, Jer. 31, 33: 'I will put my law into their inward parts and write it in their hearts.' Therefore, when we have been justified by faith and regenerated, we begin to fear and love God, to pray to Him, to expect from Him aid, to give thanks and praise Him, and to obey Him in affliction. We begin also to love our neighbors, because our hearts have spiritual and holy movements. Those things cannot occur until we have been justified by faith and, regenerated, we receive the Holy Ghost: first, because the law cannot be kept without the knowledge of Christ, and likewise the law cannot be kept without the Holy Ghost. But the Holy Ghost is received by faith, according to the declaration of St. Paul, Gal. 3, 14: 'That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through

faith.' Then, too, how can the human heart love God while it knows that He is terribly angry, and is opposing us with temporal and perpetual calamities? But the law always accuses us, always shows that God is angry. God is not therefore loved until we apprehend mercy by faith. Thus He at length becomes an object that can be loved." *Apology, chap.* III. § 4. 8.

And finally, it is thus pointed out why, notwithstanding all the imperfection and sin attaching to our works, they are still accepted of God as good and are pleasing in His sight. It is because the person is justified. Every work of man would be damnable without that. Not even Christians, though born again and led by the Spirit, can fulfill the law and be perfect in God's sight. All their virtues are full of blemishes. Their best works are such as would condemn them if their sin were not covered by the robe of Christ's righteousness. They are accepted in the Beloved, and therefore their works are acceptable. "What I have hitherto and constantly taught concerning this," says Luther in the Smalcald Articles, "I cannot in the least change; namely, that by faith, as St. Peter says, we acquire a new and clean heart, and God accounts and will account us righteous and holy for the sake of Christ, our Mediator. And although sin in the flesh has not been altogether removed and become dead, yet He will not punish or regard this. For good works follow this faith, renewal, and forgiveness of sins. And that in them which is still sinful and imperfect is not accounted as sin and defect, even for Christ's sake; but the entire man, both as to his person and his works, is and is called just and holy from pure grace and mercy, shed upon us and displayed in Christ. Wherefore we cannot boast of our merits and works, if they be viewed apart from grace and mercy, but as

it is written, 1 Cor. 1, 31: 'He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord,' viz: that he has a gracious God. For thus all is well. We say besides that if good works do not follow, faith is false and not true." *Art. Smalc. P. III. Art.* 13.

It is thus apparent that good works are necessary and why they are necessary. They are the proper utterance of the life of conformity to God's will which was man's original endowment in his creation and which is restored in his redemption and regeneration. God had ordained from the beginning that man should walk in them, and to carry out His original purpose He creates us anew in Christ Jesus.

But it is thus apparent also in what sense they are necessary. It is not by a necessity of coercion, nor by a necessity of means to attain salvation, but simply as fruits of that faith which embraces Christ and thus restores us to the divine favor and makes us and our works acceptable to God, notwithstanding all our sin.

"As to the necessity or voluntariness of good works," says our Formula of Concord, "it is manifest that in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology the following expressions are often used and repeated, that good works are necessary, which also should necessarily follow faith and reconciliation, also, that we necessarily should do and must do the good works which God has commanded. Thus also in the Holy Scriptures themselves the words 'necessity,' 'needful,' and 'necessary,' also 'should' and 'must' are used concerning what we are bound to do because of God's arrangement, command, and will, as Rom. 13, 5; 1 Cor. 9, 9; Acts 5, 29; John 15, 12; 1 John 7, 21. Therefore it is wrong to censure and reject the expressions or propositions mentioned in this Christian and proper sense, as has been done by some. For it is right to employ them for the purpose of censuring and

rejecting the secure and epicurean delusion, by which many fabricate for themselves a dead faith or vain persuasion which is without repentance and without good works, as though there could be at the same time in a heart true faith and the wicked intention to persevere and continue in sins—an impossibility; or, as though any one indeed could have and retain true faith, righteousness and salvation, even though he be and remain a corrupt and unfruitful tree, whence no good fruits whatever come; yea, even though he persist in sins against conscience, or wilfully relapse into these sins—all of which is incorrect or false." F. C. Part II, Art. 4, § 14. 15. It is all a delusion to suppose that a person can be a true believer, and thus an heir of heaven, while by choice he serves the devil and wilfully engages in deeds of darkness. For, as Luther says, "it is impossible to separate works from faith; yea, just as impossible as for heat and light to be separated from fire." Against all such vain fancies of the carnal mind it must be earnestly contended that good works are necessary.

"But here also mention must be made of the following distinction; namely, that necessity of Christ's arrangement, command and will, and of our debt, be understood; but not necessity of coercion. That is, when the word 'needful' is employed it should be understood not of coercion, but alone of the arrangement made by God's immutable will, to which we are debtor; for his commandment also shows that the creature should be obedient to its Creator. For in other places, as 2 Cor. 9, 7; Philemon 14; 1 Pet. 5, 2., the term 'of necessity' is used for that to which any one is compelled against his will, by force or otherwise, so that he acts externally for appearance, but nevertheless without and against his will. For such hypocritical works God will not have,

but wishes the people of the New Testament to be a 'willing people' (Ps. 110, 3) 'and to sacrifice freely' (Ps. 54, 6), 'not grudgingly or of necessity; but to be obedient from the heart' (2 Cor. 9, 7; Rom. 6, 17). 'For God loveth a cheerful giver.'" (2 Cor. 9, 7.) In this understanding and in such sense it is correctly said and taught that truly good works should be done freely, or from a voluntary spirit, by those whom the Son of God has liberated, as the disputation concerning the voluntariness of good works has been introduced especially with this intention. But here again it is also well to note the distinction of which St. Paul speaks, Rom. 7, 21: "I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members; that is not only unwilling or disinclined, but also 'warring against the law of my mind.' And concerning the unwilling and rebellious flesh Paul says (1 Cor. 9, 27): 'I keep under my body and bring it into subjection,' and (Gal. 5, 24; Rom. 8, 13): 'They that are Christ's have crucified,' yea, slain, 'the flesh with its affections and lusts.' But the opinion is false and must be censured, when it is asserted and taught that good works are so free to believers that it is optional with them to do or to omit them, or that they can act contrary thereto, and none the less are able to retain faith and God's favor and grace." *Form. Conc. Part II, Art.* 4, § 16–20.

If these distinctions are kept in mind many of the difficulties which are found in the doctrine of good works will vanish. Such works are necessary according to God's immutable will and order respecting His human creature. But as man was made in the image of God and thus did his Maker's will freely until all was marred by the fall, so when he is restored by God's grace in Christ he again does his Redeemer's will freely. There is no coercion employed, and

could be none, because the work ceases to be good when the person is not in harmony with God's will. Hypocritical works, however good they may appear, are not good works. Hence when necessity is placed in opposition to liberty, there is no necessity laid upon any person to do good works. They are always voluntary and always free, never coerced and constrained. Even in Christians the work is not in itself good so far as the flesh inspires wrong motives, or so far as it is done by coercing the flesh when it resists the law of the mind, but it is accepted as good only because the person is justified by faith and accepted in Christ, who is made unto us sanctification as well as redemption. But when the question is whether a person may please God without delighting in the law of the Lord after the inward man, or whether he may be a believer in Christ without having the impulse to do good works, the answer must be emphatically in the negative. In that sense and in that respect good works are necessary, not optional.

But that brings us to the second part of our subject, which is more difficult and more controverted. Necessary as good works are in the respect explained, they are not in any sense necessary to salvation. They are not necessary to attain it and not necessary to retain it. They do not justify and do not save. It is an error of far-reaching consequence to admit them into the article of justification and salvation, corrupting the whole doctrine of the gospel and depriving poor souls of the comfort and peace which the gospel is designed to bring.

"Here we must be well on our guard," says our Confession, "lest into the article of justification and salvation works may be introduced and confused with it. Therefore the propositions are justly rejected, 'that to believers good

works are needful for salvation, so that it is impossible without good works to be saved.' For they are directly contrary to the doctrine concerning the exclusive particles in the article of justification and salvation, i. e. they directly conflict with the words by which St. Paul entirely excludes our works and merit from the article of justification and salvation, and ascribes everything alone to the grace of God and merit of Christ, as explained in the preceding article. Again, these propositions concerning the necessity of good works for salvation take from tempted, troubled consciences the comfort of the gospel, give occasion for doubt, are in many ways dangerous, strengthen presumption in one's own righteousness and confidence in one's own works; besides, are accepted by Papists, and quoted in their interest, against the pure doctrine of salvation by faith alone. Thus they are contrary also to the form of sound words, where it is written that blessedness is only 'of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.' Rom. 4, 6. Also in the sixth article of the Augsburg Confession it is written that 'we are saved without works, by faith alone'." *Form. Conc. P.* II. *Art.* 4, §22-24.

Those are much mistaken who suppose that the theologians of the Reformation period had not taken into account the various considerations which a later age urged as objections to their doctrine. There is little which the learning of recent times has added to the stores in possession of the giants who lived in those days, and the best works in our controversy with Rome are still those of the olden time, when men realized the import of their wars and victories. Our busy times are again urging the necessity of good works as if they could supply the place of Christ and Him crucified, and the more the leaven of Romanism works among the

people, the greater is the need for calling to mind the results of many a battle in the wars of the Reformation. What our Church confessed was the blessed truth which was not only the product of patient and protracted study of the Holy Scriptures, but of many an inner conflict of souls that were sighing for salvation at a time when it cost something to be an evangelical Christian. That truth shall stand and shine when Romanism with all its pomp and pageantry shall have passed away, and those who confess it need not fear, though many a sect be included by Romanist sophistries to abandon the Protestant truth and fall into the snare of the devil. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away," saith the Lord. That word declares: "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3, 20. "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any one should boast." Eph. 2, 8. 9. "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3, 27. 28. These and many similar words of Holy Scripture place it beyond doubt to a sincere believer that whatever important place good works may have in the Christian system, that place is not in the article of our justification and salvation.

Our confessors rightly judged when they pronounced the error of mingling the demand of good works in the article of justification as not only disparaging to Christ, our only Savior, but also destructive to the peace of consciences. Such an error places our salvation on untenable grounds and renders salvation uncertain, whilst it attempts to take

the honor of saving us away from Christ and to give it to man's good works. "Who would not rejoice to die in the confession of such articles as that we obtain the remission of sins by faith freely for Christ's sake, that we do not merit the remission of sins by our works? The consciences of the pious will have no sufficiently sure consolations against the terrors of sin and of death, and against the devil soliciting to despair, and who in a moment blows away all our works like dust, if they do not know that they ought to be confident that they have the remission of sins freely for Christ's sake. This faith sustains and quickens hearts in the most violent conflict with despair. Therefore the cause is one which is worthy that for its sake we should refuse no danger. 'Do not yield to the wicked, but on the contrary go forward the more boldly,' whosoever thou art who hast assented to our confession, where the adversaries endeavor, by means of terrors and tortures and punishments, to drive away from that consolation which has been tendered to the entire Church in this article of ours. Testimonies of Scripture will not be wanting to one seeking them, which will establish his mind. For Paul with his entire voice, so the saying is, cries out (Rom. 3, 24 and 4, 16) that sins are freely remitted for Christ's sake. 'It is of faith,' he says, 'that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure.' That is, if the promise would depend upon one's works, it would not be sure. If remission of sins would be given on account of our works, when would we know that we had obtained this, when would a terrified conscience find a work which it would consider as sufficient to appease God's wrath?" *Apology, Art.* 20, § 84-87. If salvation depends in any respect or in any degree upon man's good works, he can never be certain that he has performed enough and must through fear of death be all his life time subject to bondage.

It is contended, indeed, by many who claim to reject all theories of work-righteousness and accept the Bible doctrine of justification by faith alone, without the deeds of the law, that good works are still necessary to salvation, not because they merit it or have any share in securing it, as the Romanists teach, but because they are always necessarily present when salvation is attained and before it is secured. Faith, it is argued, is never saving faith until it brings forth good works, and while these do not merit the justification which faith apprehends, they are still necessary to qualify faith for its apprehension. But plausible as this seems, it is in fact the Romish error of faith formed by charity, which makes all depend at last upon human work, not upon the grace of God and the merits of Christ. In that view grace is only the divine mercy infusing into the souls of men a righteousness conditioning the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and the sinner is consequently directed to look all the while at his own soul, not at the merits of Christ, for his salvation, and the whole evangelical order is perverted. That is the way of doubt and despair, not of assurance and peace.

What is true in this theory is that faith is, as Luther expresses it, "a living, efficacious, active thing," so that it is impossible for it to exist without doing good, and that the faith which is not thus active is dead, and does not justify. But what is false is that such activity and works must be present in order to justify and save, or must be present to qualify faith for apprehending Christ's righteousness, or must even be present at all, when the act of justification takes place. With the sinner's justification good works have nothing whatever to do. God's grace and the merits of Christ are all-sufficient, and nothing more and nothing else

can be alleged to be necessary without detracting from that grace and those merits. When faith is wrought in the soul by the Spirit of God unto justification, that is indeed called into existence which necessarily produces good works. It is a living faith that embraces Christ's merits, and being alive it will bear its proper fruits. And those fruits will spring forth immediately, so that in the order of time justifying faith and good works will, because they are inseparable as fire and heat, seem simultaneous; but in the order of cause and effect the faith comes first and the good works follow. Our Confession is unquestionably right when it says: "Of works that are truly good and well pleasing to God, which God will reward in this world and the world to come, faith must be the mother and source, and on this account they are justly called by St. Paul 'fruits of faith' as also 'fruits of the Spirit.'" Prior to faith there is no power in the sinner to perform good works, and prior to justification the person is not accepted of God; and his works, even if he had any power for good, would not be acceptable, seeing that all man's good, in his best earthly state, is tainted by the flesh.

To this it seems a formidable objection that when the sinner is justified he must already be in a state of regeneration and that therefore the new obedience must have already been begun in him. But it is mere confusion when it is argued that good works must necessarily belong to the article of justification and salvation because the believer who is justified is also regenerated. Certainly, "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God," and "as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." 1 John 4, 1; John 1, 12. But that only shows that faith is the one essential thing in man's salvation, from which everything else

follows. It does not imply, as opponents would have men believe, that there is a new obedience and that there are consequently good works which precede justification and are even prior to the faith which apprehends the merits of Christ unto salvation. For the act of regeneration takes place in the Holy Spirit's act of working faith, and whilst the power is thus wrought which performs good works, these works are not wrought and cannot be wrought until faith has done its proper work of apprehending the merits of Christ presented in the Gospel by which the believer and his works become acceptable to God, who sees nothing good in the sinner as long as he is not clothed in Christ's righteousness. "Faith is a divine work in us," says Luther, "that changes us, of God regenerates us, and puts to death the old Adam, makes us entirely different men in heart, spirit, mind, and all powers, and confers the Holy Ghost." Only when this change has taken place and the Holy Ghost is given can the sinner do the works which God has commanded; and only when the faith which is "the mother and source" of good works has laid hold of the Savior and embraced His merits unto justification and salvation are the works of the believer good and acceptable in God's sight. Justification must precede all good works, and the fruits contribute nothing to the essence of that of which they are simply fruits.

But are there not of necessity, it is asked, some motions produced by the Holy Spirit in the soul before justification takes place, and are not these activities good? Must there not be contrition before there can even be faith, and does not penitence imply the resolution to abandon sin and do right? Nay, more: is not faith itself a good work, and must that not precede justification? It is of course easier

to ask questions pertaining to the mysteries of grace than it is to answer them. But not for a moment should we allow ourselves to doubt the cheering truth that we are justified by faith without the deeds of the law, even though there should be difficulties presented that may puzzle theologians. And the difficulties are not as formidable as they seem. The motions in the souls of men before conversion has taken place are not good works. So far as they are good at all they are works of the Spirit which are not yet works of the person in whom they take place; so far as they are works of the person at all, they are not good, because the heart is evil and that continually. And as to faith itself, that is indeed the best of all works, as it is obedience to the first commandment. But as such good work it has nothing to do with our justification and salvation, and even it cannot be accounted a good work before God until it has performed its proper function of apprehending the merits of Christ and rendering the person acceptable. It is a gift of God bestowed to the end that it may serve as the organ to embrace the salvation in Christ, and that office it performs the very moment that it is brought into existence. Whatever good there is in it is such in God's sight only after the person has become acceptable through the merits of Christ which it apprehends. Aside from that even our faith, because of its weakness and imperfection, would not only leave us in condemnation, but be itself a work that comes short of the glory of God and thus belongs to the category of human sin. Faith as a deed of the law, like all other good works, has nothing to do with our salvation. "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3, 28.

There is, however, another aspect in which the subject is presented with a view of maintaining the necessity of good

works to salvation. If it must be admitted, it is said, that good works have no place in the article of justification, it should be admitted, on the other hand, that they have something to do with preserving the soul in a state of justification and thus ultimately with securing salvation. But this too is an error. "Since also it is disputed," says our Formula of Concord, "whether good works preserve salvation, or whether they be needful for preserving faith, righteousness, and salvation, and upon this much that is of great importance depends; for 'he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved' (Matt. 24, 13); also (Heb. 3, 6. 14); 'We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end,' we must declare precisely how righteousness and salvation are to be maintained in us, lest it be again lost. And therefore the false, Epicurean delusion is to be earnestly censured and rejected, by which some imagine that faith and the righteousness and salvation received can be lost through no sins or wicked deeds, even though wilful and intentional, but that even if a Christian without fear and shame indulge his wicked lusts, resist the Holy Ghost, and intentionally acquiesce in sins against conscience, yet that he none the less retains faith, God's grace, righteousness, and salvation. Against this pernicious delusion the following true, immutable, divine threats and severe punishments and admonitions to Christians who are justified by faith should be often repeated and impressed: 'Be not deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers . . . . . shall inherit the kingdom of God.' (1 Cor. 6, 9.) 'They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.' (Gal. 5, 21; Eph. 5, 5). 'If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die.' (Rom. 8, 13.) 'For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh upon the chil-

dren of disobedience.' (Col. 3, 6.)" "But, on the other hand, the sense is not that faith only in the beginning lays hold of righteousness and salvation, and afterward resigns its office to works, that they may in the future sustain faith, the righteousness received, and salvation; but in order that the promise, not only of receiving, but also of retaining righteousness and salvation, may be firm and sure to us, St. Paul (Rom. 5, 2) ascribes to faith not only the entrance to grace, but also that we stand in grace and boast of future glory; i. e. he ascribes the beginning, middle, and end, all to faith alone. Also (Rom. 11, 20): 'Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith.' (Col. 1, 22): 'He will present you holy and unblamable and unreprovable in His sight, if ye continue in the faith.' (1 Pet. 1, 5. 9.): 'By the power of God we are kept through faith unto salvation.' 'Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.' Since, therefore, from God's Word it is manifest that faith is the proper and only means whereby righteousness and salvation are not only received, but also preserved by God, the decree of the Council of Trent, and whatever elsewhere is set forth in the same sense should by right be rejected; namely, that our good works support salvation, or that the righteousness of faith received, or even faith itself, is either entirely or in part supported and preserved by our works." *Form. Conc.* P. II. 4, § 30–35. Our Confession clearly presents the truth that good works have no place whatever in the article of our justification and salvation. They are not necessary to secure it and not necessary to preserve it.

Much stress is indeed laid by opponents on the argument, that if by wilfully wicked works we lose our salvation, we must also by good works retain it: if deeds of sin destroy, deeds of righteousness must preserve the divine life in the

soul. That appears a necessary consequence. But the argument is fallacious. Evil works are done by a power which is ours by nature, good works are done only by a power conferred by grace and by a person who is accepted by grace. Therefore it does not follow that, if by exercising the evil that is in us in the wilful commission of sin the Holy Spirit is grieved and driven from the soul, by exercising the new life in the free performance of good works the Holy Spirit is retained. The causality of the one need not imply the causality of the other. Sin merits damnation, good works do not merit salvation. The wages of sin is death, but eternal life is the gift of God, not the wages of virtue. Sin brings death, good works do not bring life. The evil may gain the ascendancy in the believer and bring about the fall from grace by his consenting to sin against his conscience; the good cannot gain the ascendancy in the believer and bring about perseverance in grace by his good works, because his works are good only in virtue of standing in grace and so long as he perseveres. It is the power of God that saves and that keeps us unto salvation, and that not through works, but through faith, so that His is all the glory. There is no co-operation of man in the work of salvation. All the working together with God is the activity of the believers who are saved, and all the end and aim of their work is not their salvation, which is a gift of pure grace, without any deeds of the law, but the glory of Him who graciously saves them. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith

unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." 1 Pet. 1, 3–5.

To salvation faith only is necessary. That alone apprehends the righteousness of God which is revealed in the Gospel of Christ unto salvation, and that alone continues to apprehend it until the glorious goal is reached. Therefore "we believe, teach, and confess that good works should be entirely excluded, as well when the question at issue is concerning salvation, as in the article of justification before God, as the Gospel testifies with clear words where it is written: 'Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying . . . . Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.' Rom. 4, 6–8. And elsewhere: 'By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast.' Eph. 2, 8. 9." "We believe, teach, and confess also that not works, but alone the Spirit of God, through faith, maintains faith and salvation in us, of whose presence and indwelling good works are evidences." *Form. Conc.* Part I. Art. 4, § 7. 15, 16.

Good works are necessary, but they must be scrupulously excluded from the article of justification and salvation. When that article is under consideration it only produces confusion and trouble, and may produce death, to introduce them. They have nothing to do with it. Men must be urged to do good works for the glory of God and the good of man, but they must not be deluded with the vain hope that such works will save them. When the way of salvation is to be shown they must be referred to the Gospel of the grace of God in Christ, and urged diligently to use the means of grace in the Church, through which the Holy Spirit does the whole work of salvation from its trembling beginning to its

triumphant end. Without that, all insistence upon good works is only zeal without knowledge and without fruit: it does not save the soul and it does not produce works of righteousness. Especially in this busy age, where so many are endeavoring to reduce Christianity to a mere system of works, and succeeding but too often in making it a mere religion of the flesh, like all other religions that are clamoring for acceptance in the world, children of God should take this to heart, and determine to know nothing but Christ and Him crucified. Men must be warned against sin, whose wages are death; they must be shown what is the immutable will of God in regard to their lives; but first and chief must be the use of the means by which the Holy Ghost works faith in Jesus and preserves it unto eternal life in Him. Then good works follow of necessity, not by constraint and coercion, but by the necessity of effect when the cause is in operation. Then it is necessary only to show the reconciled children of God what He would have them to do: the will to do it He has already supplied, although that will is still burdened with weakness and needs new supplies of grace each day. Thus the object of God is attained through faith in the blessed Savior, "who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Tit. 2, 14.

L.

PROTESTANT CHURCH PROBLEMS IN GERMANY.

In Germany Church and State are united. There is, however, no state church for the whole empire as such. The empire in its present shape dates back only to 1871, and no attempt has been made to unite Germany ecclesiastic-

ally as she is united politically. In the nature of the case such a union of the German churches would be an impossibility. Even in the old empire, "the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation," when Roman Catholic Austria was still the controling political factor, there was not even a united Roman Catholic church of Germany, much less an Imperial church of the whole empire.

The state churches are conditioned by the political divisions of the country. This is the case because the government of the churches has always been a branch of the state government and has shared the ups and downs of the latter. As at present constituted, there are in Germany twenty-four Lutheran, eleven Reformed, seven United and four Confederated state churches. These Lutheran state churches embrace not only those where the whole church of an independent state is officially Lutheran, as is the case in Saxony, the two Mecklenburgs, Oldenburg, but also where the provincial church is such, as in the Prussian provinces acquired in 1866, namely, Hanover, Schleswig and Holstein. Some of these state churches are very small, and in America might pass as township churches. This is especially true of the Reformed state churches, which seem to exist only on paper. Indeed the Reformed church as a distinctive factor in German church life is virtually a thing of the past. The two universities which formerly were its bulwarks, Heidelberg and Marburg, have passed into rationalistic hands. This is particularly the case with the former of these two. The United churches are those where the two branches of the Protestant church, the Lutheran and the Reformed, have been united into one by the decree of the government. This policy was inaugurated in 1817 by Frederick William III. of Prussia, who in this manner celebrated the third centennial of the

Reformation. The great majority of his Protestant subjects yielded to this arrangement. According to the latest statistics, of the 18,244,405 Protestants in Prussia, 15,385,946 were United or "Evangelics," while 2,480,184 declared themselves distinctively Lutheran and 378,275 Reformed. These Lutherans, however, embrace not only those who have formally separated themselves from the united state church, but also the so-called "Positive United" men, i. e. those who think that they can retain their Lutheranism in its purity and yet live in outward connection with the Prussian Union. This party has its learned representatives in the theological faculty at Greifswald and its organ in the *Kirchenzeitung*, formerly edited by Hengstenberg, now edited by Zœckler. The Prussian Union was adopted by other smaller states, the most important among them being Baden. The confederated state churches are those in which two confessions are equal before the law, but retain their individual existence. This, for instance, is the case in Elsass, where the Reformed and the Lutheran churches are legally on the same footing.

This singular arrangement of churches in Germany is the result of a long historical development. At least as far as the Protestant church is concerned the roots go back to the Reformation. At that time the union of state and church was in many cases a blessing to the latter. The separation of the two was an idea then hardly thought of. It was regarded as self-evident that the two *must* be united, and that the state must protect the church. Indeed, humanly speaking, it is difficult to see how the Gospel could have gained a firm foothold at that time without the powerful state as an ally. Without the noble Saxon electors defending Luther, it would seemingly have been impossible for the Reformation to have accomplished its blessed work.

The state, however, was then a blessing to the church only because those who were at the head of the state were imbued with the gospel spirit and regarded their spiritual interests as of greater importance than political interests. When these conditions changed the blessing too could be changed into a curse, and the same hand that had generously been given to support the gospel cause might be used to strike it down again. Whether the *cujus regio ejus religio* was to be a blessing or a curse depended on circumstances. That even in those days it was often the latter is evident from the sad fate of Lutheranism in the Palatinate and of Protestantism in general in the Roman Catholic reaction at the end of the sixteenth century. The principle itself, which even in its Old Testament form, when as a theocracy Israel was governed by God Himself through His appointed servants, never fully accomplished its ends, must, where men without direct divine guidance are left to apply it, be fruitful of dangers to the gospel cause. That it should be otherwise is rather accidental, and the fact that it was otherwise in Saxony and other countries where the Reformation gained firm ground, is another evidence that Luther's work was of God. In a certain sense there was "a fulness of time" in this also.

The danger lying in the principle itself could only be increased when the government of the church ceased to be dependent upon the will of the one political head of the state, whose piety and devotion to the gospel cause might furnish a guarantee that the church would not suffer. When through the introduction of the constitutional principle the personal government of princes gave way to the parliamentary government through representatives of the people, then naturally the legislation and the government of the church

fell into the hands of the same powers. The principle of constitutional government, which means practically the government of the people by themselves, would seem logically to involve also the government of the church through her own agents, i. e. the independence of the church from the state. But to this extent the principle has never been applied in Germany, or indeed in continental Europe. But a principle, in itself good, if inconsistently applied, cannot but work mischief. This has emphatically been the case in Germany, notably in Prussia. As matters now stand the official heads of the states are in most cases also the official heads of the Protestant churches. In Prussia the king is the *summus episcopus* of the evangelical church; in Bavaria the Roman Catholic king, or at present the prince regent, is the highest bishop of the Lutheran church, and a similar state of affairs exists elsewhere. Actually these potentates have little to do with the government of the churches, at least not directly. They indeed appoint some of the executive officers, such as members of consistories, of synods, etc., but the legislative control of the churches lies in the hands of the parliament. Upon the political complexion of the parliament again depends the complexion of the ministry, including the cultus ministerium, which has practical control of the ecclesiastical government in the country. In this way the church is dependent upon bodies and persons who are selected for political purposes and whose actions are controlled by political considerations. In the parliament which decides the weal and the woe of the Protestant church of Prussia and other German states, there sit and vote upon measures affecting the most vital interests of the church all sorts and conditions of men, Jews and Infidels, Roman Catholics and Social Democrats, Atheists and Agnostics. The church is the

humble servant of the state and must gratefully accept the crumbs that fall from the master's table.

That such a condition of affairs cannot but be detrimental to the best interests of the Church requires no demonstration. When for instance no case of discipline can be taken up by the Church, or at any rate no public announcement that this or that member has been disciplined or excommunicated, can be made without the consent of the political authorities, the Church cannot be true to her divine mission. In the nature of the case purity of doctrine and the protection of this purity of doctrine by the application of divinely appointed means to preserve it, as also the manifestation of upright consistent Christian lives on the part of members—these two true marks of a genuine Christianity —cannot be maintained where a Church is dependent for the exercise of her proper function upon the consent of men who are actuated by principles that often run counter to the best spiritual interests of the Church. In no particular does this appear more glaringly than in Germany in the selection of theological professors. These are chosen entirely by the political authorities and the Church has no word or voice in their selection. No matter how conservative or Lutheran a church may be, the State can and often does appoint a rabid rationalist as the teacher of the young men who are to be the future pastors of these churches. The churches, neither individually nor as represented in the synods, have a right even to protest against such an appointment. In some cases the government takes into consideration the convictions of its subjects in the selection of the professors, as e. g. in the appointments made to Erlangen and to Rostock. But elsewhere some of these appointments are outrages, as in Goettingen, Giessen, Bonn and Heidelberg, where ration-

alism rules supreme, although at least in Hanover and in the Prussian Rhine provinces the churches are Lutheran or at least conservative.

One great trouble in the matter is that the Protestant churches of Germany are not one in the matter of faith. From Confessional Lutheranism on the right to rampant rationalism on the left all possible and impossible shades of thought are represented in what is called the Protestant or Evangelical church. There is probably no state church that is soundly Lutheran to the core in all particulars. The nearest approach to it seems to be that of Mecklenburg and its university at Rostock. Erlangen and Leipzig show a wider departure from the old landmarks. In the nine Prussian universities, the so-called Mediating theology is officially recognized, i. e. a theology which tries to mediate and compromise between Biblical truth and modern philosophy and science. Naturally the former suffers to a greater or less extent in this transaction. Naturally also the conception of Mediating theology is a vague one. The measure of sacrifice made to what is regarded as modern science, depends not upon the Word of revelation, but upon the opinion of the "theologian." As is quite natural under the circumstances we find in the make-up of this class, men of positive Biblical convictions, such as was Tholuk and such as some of the Halle men are yet, and at the same time also men who deny every fundamental principle of the Christian faith. And to make matters worse there are no less than two rationalistic schools of theology, one which represents the Baur school of Tuebingen, the other the Ritschl school of Goettingen. The difference between the two is only on the philosophical basis of theological speculations. The old school dismembers and empties Scripture of its contents

according to Hegel's philosophy; the new school does so according to Kant. The representative of the thought, notably of the old school, in church life is the rationalistic *Protestanten Verein*, a voluntary association of professors, pastors and congregations, whose devout object is to establish "liberal," i. e. rationalistic religious thought throughout Germany. Unfortunately these people exert an influence in church goverment that is far beyond their relative numerical strength. Indeed to a great extent in Prussia, and altogether in Baden the government of the church is in their hands, and they are unscrupulous in the way in which they use their power to suppress confessional or even conservative thought. At some of the universities they have absolute control and will not admit of a representative of the old views by their side. The positive Christians of Baden have for years petitioned in vain for a conservative man at Heidelberg. The rationalistic state government simply refuses to give them one. All that the Rhenish Christians did and said against Bender of Bonn and his infamous Luther speech of 1883 have not shaken him in his chair at Bonn. He still teaches theological students that the Biblical religion is only one phase of natural religion.

That positive Christians, or at any rate professed Lutherans, have been content to endure this condition of affairs, can only be explained on the score that the present status is the result of a long series of historical causes. Abstractly considered, and without these historical connecting links, no consistent Christianity would have endured it. Indeed, it has led to the organization of free churches, separated from the state, at various places, not only in Prussia, but also in Saxony. But these free churches are all weak numerically, and unfortunately not always strong in their principles. A

powerful agitation against existing conditions that has enlisted the sympathies and co-operation of a larger class of men has not taken place until within the last year, and even this opposition is only directed against outward abuses in church-government, and not against the inward decadence of Christian faith and of confessional life. It accordingly does not go to the root of matters, but only seeks to cut off some of the ill-shaped branches that have grown out of the root, or at least get their vitality from these roots.

The outward occasion for the outbreak of this agitation throws a clear light on its real character and animus. It was not the recognition on the part of the leaders of the church, that, as organized and governed at present, the church could not fulfill her heavenly appointed mission, and that the church might be untrammelled in her Gospel work it would be necessary to free her from the yoke of the state,—not these convictions prompted the aggressive movements now so powerful in Prussia.

In the origin of the agitation these reasons occupied at best a subordinate role. The actual cause of the outbreak was the peace made between Bismarck and the Vatican, in which the Berlin government made far-reaching concessions to Rome. The government annulled the May laws and other legal enactments that had been passed to compel the Roman Catholic Church of Germany to bow to the authorities that be in matters in which the former claimed that they could not conscientiously submit. After fifteen years of *Culturkampf* Bismarck, it seems, needed the Roman Catholic votes in the Parliament, and accordingly officially closed the contest by giving the Roman Catholics not all that they wanted but enough to satisfy for the time being the Vatican authorities. Bismarck's trip to Canossa did not accordingly consist

in yielding to Rome rights which Rome had never possessed in Germany, but only in giving up rights which he all along had claimed were necessary to the state's existence.

This matter aroused the Protestants. They demand that corresponding concessions be made to them. They ask (1) that the church be allowed to control her own affairs and be not dependent upon the political agents that stand between the church and their legal head, the king; notably in regard to the selection of theological professors; and (2) that more money be given to the church for its work. The last Prussian parliament refused to take up these measures, and Bismarck declared himself opposed to them in the most violent terms. He claims to see visions of a Protestant hierarchy in case these petitions are granted, and states that one hierarchy has been enough for him. But the Protestants are determined, and are taking the matter into politics. They have learned the tactics of agitation from the Roman Catholic neighbors, and are endeavoring to create a political party in favor of the project. The Prussian parliament will soon assemble, and the matter will then again be brought up.

The victory of the Roman Catholics has however aroused Protestant Germany in another way. The Roman Catholics are as aggressive in public life as they are in state affairs. They feel jubilant and think that they can prepare to reap the harvest which disintegrating Protestantism is preparing for them. They are trying to wrestle learning and science out of the hands of the Protestants. Janssen's famous effort, by objective historiography, to prove that the Reformation was the greatest calamity that ever befel Europe fully exposes the sentiments and feelings of the Roman Catholics of Germany over against Protestantism, which it sees typically represented in the spirit and genius of Prussia and of Ger-

many. And the downfall of this principle in the life of the nations is now confidently expected. Cardinal Manning, of England, has prophesied that the last battle between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism will be fought out on the sands of Berlin. Whether he means this literally or figuratively may not be certain; but in either case the result would be the same. Janssen's thesis that the Reformation, or rather the principles of the Reformation are the cause and origin of all the ills that modern society in state, church, and social order, is heir to, is being practically applied. Roman Catholic writers are trying hard to persuade the masses through tracts, articles, and discussions of all kinds, that the social ills, of which all Germany complains, have their fountain head in Protestantism, and that if those ills are to be removed it is necessary to remove the cause. Agitation in this department is headed by the famous Bishop v. Ketteler, of Mayence, and has enlisted the co-operation of some of the finest Roman Catholic scholars in Germany. The old enemy is accordingly aggressive and combative now in Germany; probably more so than he has been at any time since the "Deformation" before the thirty years war. And this aggressiveness is directed to the undermining of Protestantism in its firmest bulwarks, and evidently aims at winning the masses back to the "only saving" Church of Rome.

It is this spirit of modern Catholicism in Germany that has aroused Protestant opposition. This opposition found its outward expression in the *Evangelischer Bund*, which proposes to fight Rome "with word and pen." It has secured a membership of over ten thousand, and is active and energetic. It is fathered chiefly by the mediating men, at their head Beyschlag, of Halle. The recent Lutheran Conference in Hamburg declared itself, not against the work of the *Bund*,

but against a union with it, on the ground that its confessional status was unsatisfactory. The *Bund* declares that it adheres to the faith "in Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God and the Mediator between God and man; and also the principles of the Reformation." It is a notorious fact that a number of the leaders of the new association interpret this otherwise correct standpoint in a Pickwickian sense, and in view of this the Conference thought it best not to favor an organic connection.

What the outcome of the whole matter will be only a prophet and a prophet's son could venture to predict. The principles involved are certainly of the greatest importance and far-reaching in their application. The means and manner in which it is sought to secure the success of the Evangelical Church, do not seem to be of the best. The interests of Evangelical truth as such, and for itself, is too much lost sight of, and the possession of this truth as a weapon of offence and defence is not properly appreciated. If the battle is fought as Luther fought his, with the open Bible in his hand, the outcome would not be doubtful. It is only truth that can conquer error. *Magna est veritas et praevalebit.*

G. H. S.

THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION.

From the German of Dr. Philippi's Glaubenslehre, by Rev. L. H. Schuh.

The idea of creation has sprung only from the soil of a positive divine revelation, and where it is yet found outside of this sphere (as in Mohammedanism, Rationalism) it may be shown that it has been borrowed from it. In ante-Christian heathendom, in which the content of the natural human

reason was plainly stamped unmixed with ideas of revelation, the idea of creation is not found, for all pagan speculation, which, on the one hand, is the root, on the other, the blossom and expression of the religious views of a people, arises either from the pantheistic doctrine of a cosmic evolution, or from the dualistic doctrine of a cosmic formation. Either God is viewed, as it were, as a germ from which the world, by an inner necessity, has unfolded itself; or, according to its matter, it is made equally eternal with the world-forming principle, so that with the divine reason (νοῦς) its original matter (ὕλη) in which God gave form to His ideas, is co-ordinated. In the first case God is the original substance, the dark primeval cause of the world evolving itself; in the latter case the role of a world-former or a universal architect (δημιουργός) is assigned Him. In both modes of conception the human mind shows itself to be governed by the sensual view of empirical reality, in which, of course, all that originates comes into existence either by way of begetting and by organic development out of a given germ, or by the formation of germ-matter through a power from without. Finite, reflecting reason has always firmly held that from nothing nothing can originate (the ἐξ οὐδενος οὐδέν of Greek philosophy), and to which may be opposed only the self-birth of the universe out of nothing, but not the absolute, productive, divine causality. Both the pantheistic doctrine of a universal evolution, as well as the doctrine of a cosmic formation contradict the fundamental assumptions of our dogmatic thinking. For from the idea of our real and reciprocal communion with God we have arrived at the absolute personality and the absolute, free omnipotence of God. If now the world is conceived as an involuntary evolution out of God, then God is no longer the absolute personal One;

but if an original matter exists, which has never been entirely overcome by the divine forming-power, there is another boundary set to divine power than divine will, God is then no longer the Almighty. Where the conception of the personality and the free omnipotence of God is held fast, there the idea of creation in opposition to a mere cosmic evolution or formation must find a place. The world is then not merely a necessary development out of the divine original substance, but a free personal positing (Setzung) by divine omnipotence, and both in regard to the matter as well as the form. For the cosmic matter is only intended to be the bearer and embodiment of the cosmic idea, and must, as its perfect realization, be permeated and governed by it. If matter were co-eternal and co-original with God Himself, His absoluteness would, to start with, appear limited by a self-dependent principle opposing Him, and He would not have been able to use this matter entirely according to His own will and through it to give form to His cosmic ideas, even as the plastic artist is never able entirely to overcome the germ-matter and permeate it thoroughly with his creative idea. Even in the most perfect earthly work of art, an unpermeated rest of resisting earthly *hyle* is to be observed. Therefore, matter also must have been made by God.

The doctrine of creation is also one of the fundamental doctrines of the universal Christian Church on earth. It is already contained in the Apostolic Symbol, was defended against Gnostic dualism by the oldest church-fathers, by Irenæus and Tertullian, and remained throughout all time the common property of Christendom acknowledging the revelation of God. It was more particularly described as a creation out of nothing; and the scholastic divinity, to avoid all ambiguity, distinguished between privative and negative

nothing (*nihilum privativum* and *negativum*) i. e. the relative and the absolute nothing, and defined the creation of the world as a *creatio ex nihilo negativo.* The nothing from which the world was created is not to be conceived of as a substance, as matter still formless and shapeless, which therefore relatively is not yet, and is only through its formation stamped to a definite existence: but rather is the world made out of the absolute nothing, whereby not only the world's form, but also its matter is negated as being originally given (= *negatio omnis entitatis*). Also the older dogmaticians of our church followed this distinction, among whom Quenstedt explained the *ex nihilo* by *post nihilum.* The world is made out of nothing, would mean, the world is made after nothing, since before creation there was nothing from which it could have been created.

Concerning the expression *creatio ex nihilo,* it is known to originate from 2 Macc. 7, 28, where it is said that God ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν, heaven, earth and man, which the Vulgate renders *fecit ex nihilo.* It was claimed that in this passage there was found the Platonic Dualism of Philo, to whom τὰ μὴ ὄντα is matter lacking all qualities, from which God made the world. Nevertheless, this passage in Macc. has not the relative negation μή, but the absolute negation οὐκ, and τῷ οὐκ ὄντα defines the *nihilum negativum* in distinction from the τὰ μὴ ὄντα, the *nihilum privativum.* In addition, the whole train of thought of this passage is decisive for this view. For it points to the absolute omnipotence of God, that it is even able to raise from death, that it has given life and created heaven and earth, and it admonishes in this faith confidently to die the martyr's death. Where in the sphere of the dualistic contemplation of the world is such confidence found? It is justifiable only in regard to the creator

of the world, but not to its former. Even Ecc. 11, 18, where it is said that God's all-mighty hand formed the earth out of shapeless matter (ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὑλης) there is not to be found an intimation of dualism, but a mere reference to the *Tohu Wabohu*, to the unordered chaos of Genesis, which was called into existence through the so-called *creatio prima*, and was afterwards formed through the so-called *creatio secunda*. For it is said that God could make and send terrible, unknown animals against the godless, even as in the wilderness He formed and sent fiery serpents (θῆρας πυρπ νόον φυσῶντας ἄσθμα). It was in order here to refer only to His original world-forming power, by which creative power is in no wise denied Him. Yea, it is even expressly added, that without means by one single breath and through the spirit of His power He could destroy His enemies.

But if men have read their doctrine of a dualistic world formation even into the Apocrypha without any sufficient warrant, much more is this the case with the canonical writings. Their whole tendency is at the outset opposed to such presumption. Everywhere God appears in them in His omnipotence to have absolute dominion over the creature, and to be using it according to His good pleasure. The scriptural conception of miracles is decisive here. As the eternal cosmic formation or development excludes miracles, so miracles as the result of free personal omnipotence exclude dualism and pantheism. What is binding for the religious view taken by the Scriptures is also valid for its ethical view. For dualism and pantheism make matter the principle of evil, the Bible, on the contrary, conceives sin as the setting up of the will of the creature against that of the Creator. The former derives the contamination of the soul from the body, the latter ascribes the original corruption of

the body to the soul. The more arbitrary is it therefore, to put into the account of creation in Genesis a dualistic world-forming doctrine. Compare on the other hand Delitzsch and Keil on Gen. 1, 1, and also notice that *barah* certainly is intended to express the divine causality as absolute. Or should the passages referring back to the account of creation, Ex. 20, 11; 31, 17; Ps. 33, 6–9; 90, 2; 95, 4–7; 102, 26 ff.; 104 29 f.; 115, 15; 121, 2; Job 28, 24 ff.; Isa. 42, 5; 45, 18; Jer. 10, 11; 12, 16; 32, 17; John 1, 3; Acts 17, 24; Rom. 1, 20, 25; 11, 36; 1 Cor. 8, 6; Col. 1, 16; Heb. 2, 10; 3, 4; Rev. 4, 11; which so plainly exhibit the unconditional omnipotence as the sole ground for the origin of all creatures, really desire to teach nothing else than the forming of the world from an originally existing matter? Thus then the exalted idea of a creation out of nothing extends throughout the entire Holy Scriptures from the first to the last book. Where is there even the trace of a reference to an eternal matter and a formation of the world out of the same? Also Rom. 4, 17 (vide my commentary on this passage), and Heb. 11, 3, (comp. Luenemann in C.) do not affirm this, rather the exact opposite. Especially the latter passage offers a direct *dictum probans* for the churchly doctrine of the creation *ex nihilo.*

Thus then the doctrine of the absolute creation approves itself as dogmatical truth through the unanimity of our Christian consciousness, the universal faith of the Church and through the revelation of Scripture. And here the individual special faith as also the common Church faith is undoubtedly only the correct subjective transposition and reflection of the original objective divine revelation of the whole creation as the pure product of free personal omnipotence.

When now according to this dogmatical principle we

are by necessity led to accept a creation of the world in opposition to a development or formation of the world, the question arises, whether from the same principle we can deduce a statement concerning the origin or the want of origin (Anfangslosigkeit) of the world, or in other words, whether we are to accept a temporal or an eternal (i. e. without beginning) creation? To a certain extent the necessity of accepting the latter view has been insisted on. Even if this view originally has its root in pantheistic soil, and is also by Schleiermacher interwoven with his Spinozian philosophy, it may yet be asked, whether it cannot be separated from this and be properly used in the sphere of theism? The world according to matter and form could possibly be considered as a free product of divine omnipotence and as a product without beginning. The necessity of a creation lacking a beginning was sought to be derived from the conception of time. It seems impossible to conceive an end to time, for in our thinking we may proceed forwards or backwards, yet we cannot fix any moment of time and make it the first or the last, but we are compelled to advance to a preceding or succeeding moment, and so we have by necessity a temporal *progressus in infinitum.* Nevertheless such purely metaphysical arguments, even could they claim irrefutable validity, would yet in themselves be insufficient to prove an article of faith. Besides this the contrary to this manner of reasoning could with equal right be maintained. For one could never come out of this "without a beginning" and reach a certain historical moment of time, because without a beginning and a sure point of departure there is no goal. Kant has therefore rightly set up side by side as being equally capable of proof the thesis: The world has a beginning in time; and the antithesis: It has no beginning, but in respect

of duration it is infinite. It is just as possible to prove the necessity, as to conceive the impossibility of time without a beginning. And even if thought would not contradict thought, yet certainly the thought would contradict the conception. For even though we must conceive of time as having neither beginning nor end, yet we cannot conceive an infinite time, to which contradiction of the *intellectus* and of the *imaginatio* already Spinoza and after him Strauss have referred, and for themselves they have naturally decided in favor of the conception. However, that the abstract conception of time as the conception of consecutiveness or of succession, compels us to set a time without beginning or end, because even the pure conception of consecutiveness would be destroyed as soon as the consecutiveness in thought would be cut and stopped, from this it by no means follows, that also real things, in whose succession time becomes a fact, are to be conceived as wanting a beginning or an end, or that concrete time itself is to be conceived as infinite. The assertion, the world must be without a beginning, because time in itself, i. e. the conception of unceasing succession must be conceived as without a beginning, is therefore neither a dogmatically binding, nor a metaphysically irrefutable assertion.

If now no deciding argument for a creation necessarily without a beginning could be deduced from the creature subject to time, the further effort has been made to derive it from the idea of God Himself, more accurately, from the divine unchangeableness and from the love of God.

The assumption of the transition of God from not-creating to creating, seems at first to subject Him to changeableness. Against this already Augustinus has remarked that the decree of creating the world is to be placed as one eternal in

God with one and the same eternal unchangeable will willed, that created things at first should not be, as long as they were not, and that afterwards they should be, when they began to be, etc. (Comp. de civit. Dei, XII, 17.) However, even if in this way the transition from not-willing to willing is solved, yet the transition from mere willing to fulfilling is not thereby solved and thus God still appears to be subject to changeableness. The same transition meets us everywhere, where God in the midst of time has performed some new act of creation, and if we wished utterly to deny it, giving ourselves up unconditionally to the drift of logical consequences, we would also be compelled to deny miracles in general and with these also the fundamental miracle, the incarnation of God, and thus we would destroy the saving faith itself. If we must continue in the mystery of faith in the middle, then we can also do so in the beginning, that God without change of His eternal essence produces temporal results, which present themselves to us on the finite standpoint of our reflection as the transition from the willing to the deed.

Finally the effort has been made to derive the necessity of a creation without a beginning from the idea of love, because the essence of love includes that by an internal necessity it must prove itself active, and that love ceases to be such when it ceases to employ itself. With men of course love, where it is, must manifest itself both on account of the given object as well as on account of the living subject itself, because the latter would find nothing satisfying its existence without an activity in love. But as far as the former is concerned, human love presupposes an object of its activity, as this is already negatively proven in this, that a father does not love his child before he has begotten it. So long as there is no object of love offered, man has no duty of expressing his love.

If one assumed that divine love, in distinction from human, is not limited to an existing object, but that it is according to its essence creative and as such was already obliged from the beginning to place an object of its love, which man also by virtue of his subjective desire of love would do, if no object were offered his love and he were able to produce one: then this demand is fully satisfied through the eternal begetting of the Son, in which the divine desire of love has found its absolute satisfaction, since from eternity the Father stands in blessed reciprocity to the Son of His love, giving and taking love, which, limited to an object co-original with Himself, can alone satisfy His inner necessity of love. Thus besides the eternal begetting of the Son we have no need of a creation of the world wanting a beginning for the primeval realization of divine love, nor will the latter, because not co-original with God but finite, suffice to the satisfaction of this infinite desire of love. All those who have maintained the necessity of a creation without a beginning, based upon the idea of divine love, have therefore also always questioned the Biblical and ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity.

With our dogmatical premises we must antagonize the necessity of a creation having no beginning. The question arises: whether we can not at least admit the possibility? The scholiasts, as Thomas Aquinas, admitted this logical possibility, or as Duns Scotus they at least thought that the possibility and the impossibility of an originless creation could be maintained with equal probability. Among the dogmaticians of our church even Calov and Quenstadt concede that the question, whether the world could have been created from eternity, concerns no article of faith, wherefore neither of both views could be condemned as heresy, much less as atheism. They themselves, of course, denied the

possibility of an originless creation. And we think they did it rightly. The conception of creation kept pure excludes the possibility of an originless creation. For the conception of creation includes also the idea of initiation. That which was not at first and afterwards was called into existence, by free omnipotence, can not already have been always. This is true of an indivitual as well as of all creatures, whether we understand by the latter this present universe, or with Origen a succession of worlds. It is difficult, probably impossible, and Origen himself is an example, in accepting an originless creation, to keep apart the conception of creation out of nothing and that of begetting out of the essence of God. But when the clear boundary line between the Son and the world is once obliterated, the falling from theism into pantheism will be difficult to prevent. The conception of an aboriginal world nominally brought forth out of nothing by the free omnipotence of God, will always set forth the contradiction "out of nothing" and "originless," and thus pass over into the conception of an originless development out of the eternal essence of God. If between God and the world we affirm a relation not of mere substantiality but of true causality, and if we are in earnest with the latter assumption, then the causal priority of God before the world includes His temporal priority. Kurtz has strikingly said (The Bible and Astronomy, 3d ed., p. 36): "When once infinity has been ascribed to space, and eternity to time, then the conception of creation and with it the conception of a personal creator exalted above time and space, has been dissolved in the *aqua fortis* of human thought and has vanished from our hands." The denial of the possibility of an originless creation does not include a limitation of divine omnipotence. For if the concept, creature, excludes

the "without beginning," then the sentence, that God *could* not make the creature without a beginning, is only identical with this other, that He could not do what was unreasonable and contradictory.

With this we reject the necessity as well as the possibility of an originless creation. Its actuality thus falls of its own accord. The actuality would at all events have to be questioned, even if one admitted the possibility. The "in the beginning" (im Anfang) of Genesis, as also the "in the beginning" (im Anfang) of the prologue of St. John, designate a temporal beginning. Only that Genesis says what God did in the beginning, but John what already existed at the beginning of divine action. By this is marked the difference between the world begun in time and the eternal Logos. That the book of Genesis means a temporal beginning appears irrefragably from this that it accepts a beginning as well as an end of creation. For God rested on the seventh day from all His works. Already the childlike view and manner of expression that govern this whole account which everywhere refers only to the doings of God on time, exclude at the outset the abstract conception of an originless creation. We are not only not justified in transposing the Biblical presentation of an origin of the world into the speculative idea of an originless creation, but this is also excluded by other passages of Scripture. For before this world and its origination the Bible places eternity. Ps. 90, 2; Comp. John 17, 5 and f. With this the thought of another world having preceded this present one is excluded. If not then there would have been a time prior to this world in which the world preceding the present world was made, and not eternity itself. The transposition of the temporal *prius* into a mere causal *prius* is the purest arbitrariness. He who has

once comprehended the idea of an originless creation, will no longer express himself as the Scriptures do, and designate eternity as something that was before the laying of the world's foundation. Comp. Prov. 8, 22. f. Besides this the 90th Psalm places the eternity of God immediately before the forming of this earth, which, according to the Psalm agreeing with Genesis, is co-temporal with the creation of the world. ("Before the mountains were brought forth, or even Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God.") That the formation of the earth took place in time, also the advocates of an originless creation admit. Even if from this standpoint one could say, God was before the creation of the earth, yet never in order to designate His eternity could it be said that He was before the forming of the earth, for before this forming, if it did not take place in the beginning of time, there would yet be another time and not eternity itself. It is evident that the placing of eternity before the beginning of time, setting in with creation, is a popular way of expression, for whatever is antecedent is, viewing the concept closely, temporal and not eternal. Nevertheless the human manner of representation is compelled, if once a beginning of time is accepted and eternity is placed in its relation to time, to put it before this beginning and this oxymoron is thereby justified, since we are not here concerned about a "before" in time, but about a "before" prior to time. For it is just the "before" prior to time which in our popular and finite way of thought and expression, constitutes our conception of an absolute negative of time. What is not before this or that time, but before time in general, is not in time.

The mocking question, What then did God, alone and idle in all eternity, do before the creation of the world? Lu-

ther, as is well known, has rebutted by the ironical answer, that He sat in the forest cutting rods for useless questioners. The churchly dogmaticians rejected it as a *quaestio furiosorum*, which is of no account. And indeed this question is also not only a vain but also senseless one, since in eternity there is neither time nor leisure which might grow tedious to one; and in addition to this God in His absolute being within Himself (Sn ſich ſein) had in Himself already absolute satisfaction, and did not need to seek this in the creation of a world.

This leads us to enquire into the reason which determined God to create the world. The unanimous answer of the Church of Christ is that God created the world as the result of a free volition, that it is to be looked upon as the product of the good pleasure of His love. Only the Son is the necessary production of His being, the world on the contrary is the free production of His will. Since we antagonized the necessity of an originless creation, we have at the same time rebutted the assumption of a necessary creation. It has been claimed that the divine love-manifestation necessitates the creation of a world. But we have seen that this was from eternity satisfied through the begetting of the Son. If it requires the world for its satisfaction, then God needs the creature as much and is as dependent upon it, as it needs Him and depends upon Him. It will then be necessary to say with the cherubinish wanderer of Angelus Silesius:

"That God is so blessed and lives without desire,
He has received from me as well as I from Him."

And then further:

"God cares as much for me as I do care for Him,
I help Him to cherish His being as He helps me to cherish mine."

What God needs for His self-complacency, that He will also have produced for his self-completion according to the necessity of His being. The assertion of a necessary creation, necessarily leads to pantheism. This indeed is controverted by modern speculative theism. It has even set up the opposite assertion, that the acceptance of a necessary creation follows from the rightly conceived idea of the divine personality. Thus Rothe, Theological Ethics, Vol. I, p. 85ff. He distinguishes between a threefold form (*modus hypertain*) of the being (Sein) of God, the divine essence, the divine nature and the divine personality. Only inasmuch as God exists essentially as such a triad (Dreies): as absolute essence, as absolute nature and as absolute personality, He really is. With this that God determines Himself unto absolute personality is His immanent life-process brought to conclusion in a manner perfect. However, whilst God, thinking and determining both in one act, determines Himself as personality, i. e. as Ego, He thinks and determines *Ego ipso* at the same time *His non-ego* a something other, which is *not God.* This conception of personality, or of the Ego, necessarily involves that the Ego oppose to itself a non-ego. So the creation is the immediate consequence of His self-determination unto personality. For that non-ego of God which He as personality immediately posits over against Himself that in it He may give Himself being (Sein), is the world. According to this the creation is an absolutely necessary act of God. As truly as God is God, He must be a Creator. Thus Rothe.—Here again we have a metaphysical deduction which at the outset gives us no dogmatical certainty. Nor does this deduction appear to us as in any way binding. The justifications of the idea of divine personality, formerly essayed by us, has proven, that the

genesis and consequence of human self-consciousness cannot, without any further ado, be transferred to God. That man with the placing of the ego, must at the same time set up the non-ego, lies in this, that He is a finite ego, that he is a member of the universe, and that therefore the relation of the ego and *non-ego* which was here in reality established already, afterwards also reflects itself in his consciensness. Yet even if by way of speculation it could be proven that the divine *ego* must set up over against the *non-ego* and unite with it, there would thereby be given only the return to the churchly doctrine of the trinity, or the return to pantheism would be unavoidable. For this divine *Ego* requiring a *Tu* would be the Son; if not, and if it be the world, then would the divine personality concededly already perfect still need the world for a supplement and if not for its supplementary completion, yet at all events for its preservation. For then too the *Ego* would cease to be *Ego*, if it did not set up over against itself the world as the required *Tu* (Thou).

In general we hold that this modern speculative rationalism is trying to sustain itself in an untenable suspense between theism and pantheism. In the first place the world—i. e. pantheistically considered the explication of the divine essence—is theistically in the form of the divine nature transferred into God Himself, and then again through creation, which is to be the explication of the divine nature in the sphere of finiteness, it is taken out of God. One would think that this so-called nature in God itself would already be the *non-ego*, the divine essence differentiated (Anderssein) and through which He arrives at self-consciousness so that this divine personality would not supplementarily need a *non-ego*. Thus however we really have given us a *non-ego* at once as a precondition and as a consequence of the divine personality.

The fact is, he who firmly and earnestly holds the conception of a divine personality and of creation in opposition to a pantheistic cosmic development out of an absolute divine first cause, cannot avoid to conceive the creation of the world as an act of the free divine will to which there is no kind of compulsion in God. Such freedom has been derided as wilfulness and the absolute identity of freedom and necessity in God has been maintained. Nevertheless theism preserved in its purity cannot dispence with the difference of the necessary will, with which God wills Himself, and of the free will with which He wills the world, and in this point also we need not be ashamed of the boundary of our reason in the interest of faith. It will not do to limp on both sides, and endeavor to unite faith in the revealed mystery with absolute comprehension on our part. The new speculative patch will at last tear loose from the old garment of faith. Here an open and an honest either, or, is demanded. The actual refutation of the assertion that freedom and necessity are identical in God, which necessarily leads to the denial of the Biblical-ecclesiastical conception of miracles, is contained in the actual experience of the greatest of all miracles, the miracle of regeneration. Whoever thinks that he has no need of this, will never be convinced by human argument. The Lord God will in due time find the fig leaf of the so-called demands of thought (Denkbedürfnisse) with which man seeks to cover the nakedness of his lack of desire for salvation (Heilsbedürfnislosigkeit) and his little reason against the great truth of God, and with which he tries to hide himself from the Omniscient One. The absolute freedom with which God wills the world is just as little to be called wilfulness, as the absolute necessity with which He wills Himself. For as the latter is no compulsion

brought to bear upon Him from without, but an inner free necessity, so the former is no accidental notion, but it borrows the motive of its action from divine love and proceeds according to the norms of divine wisdom.

If we abide as by the temporal so also by the free in contradistinction to an eternal and necessary creation, it naturally follows, that God could also have not made the world, as well as that He could have made it otherwise than He did. He could with the inexhaustibleness of His creative reason have given it another arrangement, organization and nature than He did; but in accordance with the harmony existing between His free omnipotence and His wisdom and love, which is always to be held fast, any other form and shape of the world as well as the present would have to be an expression and a representation of divine attributes in the sphere of the finite. How and what God would ever have created, His creation would in every case be good and complete, as this is expressly said of the present world by the Word of revelation, Comp. Gen. 1, 10. 12. 18. 21. 25. 35; Deut. 32, 4; Ps. 104. 31; also Jesus Sirach 18, 1; 39, 21. 39.

The question arises, in how far the world in spite of existing physical and moral evil can be called good. We will not dare to answer this question in the manner of the Leibnitz Theodicee. For unto us evil is not the necessary predicate of the finite defectiveness, not a something necessarily implied in the very conception of the creature, not the not yet existing good, the never realized coincidence but the infinite approximation of the finite to the infinite so that God, if indeed He wished to create a world, must make it, to be creatural, also finite, and to be finite also defective, and therefore could not forego the use of evil in its realization. Then we arrive at the

paradox that the imperfection of the world is a factor in the conception of its perfection. To us, moreover, moral evil or sin is the free personal opposition of the creature to God, and therefore something that should absolutely not be. On the other hand, we must admit, that not the existence, but probably the possibility of sin belongs to the conception of the perfection of the world, for this possibility is nothing else than the actuality of creature freedom, because freedom involves the possibility of abuse, i. e. of sin.

If the fact is established that the universe is incomplete, if it were only a mechanism moving according to necessary laws of nature, or a developing organism, without culminating in free personality, which alone makes the fellowship of love between God and men possible, the highest point of the perfection of the world; then it follows self-evidently, that with freedom also the possibility of sin belongs to the conception of cosmic perfection. Nevertheless only the possibility not also the actuality of sin is to be considered, which sin moreover, being a consequence of the abuse of freedom on the part of man, is to be considered as a disturbance of the original perfection of the world coming in later, and which is permitted by God for the purpose of maintaining the freedom of man. The perfection on the part of God however is reinstated and upheld over against this disturbance, first through the imposing of physical evil culminating in death, and then especially through redemption. For physical evil is to be just as much considered a disturbance of the original perfection of the world, as moral evil; however, after the entrance of sin as the first negation of the harmonic order of the world set through creation, evil with its culmination in death, as negation of the negation, as a just punishment of

sin, is nothing more than the adjusting of the disturbance and the reproduction of original harmony. Thus not sin in itself nor death in itself, but the possibility of sin and death in connection with and as a reaction against sin made real, belong to the idea partly of an original, partly of a reconstructed cosmic perfection. The redemption, however, is not only an equalization of sin through the placing of death, but an abolition of death through the abolition of sin and a renewed placing of righteousness, in fact a *restitutio in integrum*, so that the harmony of the world disturbed by sin is to some extent restored and externally maintained on the part of God negating through punishment, and to some extent positively through redemption; man, however, whichever kingdom he may subjectively choose, that of punishment or that of redemption, is yet not able anew to disturb the objective perfection of the world.

The redemption is not only a positive reconstruction of original cosmic perfection, but in its accomplishment in the form of cosmic transfiguration it is also cosmic completion. For the original cosmic perfection does not in itself include cosmic completion, because perfection does not exclude development, even as the perfect germ finds its full unfolding in the plant and thus its completion. The original cosmic perfection consists in this, that as in itself it was already a revelation of divine glory, yet at the same time it was capable of receiving the glory disclosing itself, and progressing unto its goal. Even without the intervention of sin it would by way of immediate development have reached this goal, now it reaches it in the round-about way of redemption. Holy love has created it, has redeemed it, and will glorify and perfect it. But there belongs to its perfection this, that freedom be given the personal creature to resist

this decree of the holy love, and then to call forth the one-sided revelation of divine holiness, the revelation isolated from divine love, and this indeed in its final completion. As He did in the beginning so in the end will God look upon what He has made and will pronounce it good, very good; and indeed as in the beginning in an initial so in the end will He declare it good in a completed manner.

From the question concerning the perfection of the world we arrived at the motive of its creation, which motive was none other than the freedom of divine love. With this the last question concerning the world's creation, to wit, its end, has already been answered. This end, conditioned as it is by divine love, can only consist in the divine communication of life to the creature. Divine impartation of life to the rational creature is in its highest potency divine self-impartation. The purpose of creation thus aims at the blessedness of the rational creature in the personal life-communion with God, in the possession of God, of eternal life. In this impartation of self to the creature, on which account creation might with Hamann be called a work of divine humility, God yet sustains Himself and takes Himself back from it, so that creation might just as well be called a work of divine self-exaltation as a work of divine self-humiliation. For just through the manifestation of His condescending love, He has glorified Himself in the highest degree, made great His name, and made His wonderful works to be remembered among the children of men. And this effect of His love realized in creation will also be given as the object, so that we arrive at the acceptation of a double purpose followed by God in creation, namely, the blessedness of the creature and the glorification of His allmighty and allwise love. The first the older dogmaticians designated as the intermediate

purpose (*finis intermedius*), the latter as the ultimate purpose (*finis ultimus.*) Certainly God is glorified in His love through the blessedness of the creature, as well as vice versa the blessedness of the creature consists only in the glorification of God, so that the glorification of God and tho blessedness of the creature, or the middle and ultimate purpose, unite into one. Yet we are to consider the glorification of God as the ultimate purpose of our existence and in as far as God desired this, He has made the glorification of Himself the ultimate purpose of creation. He wished to glorify Himself through a complete manifestation of His love in the blessedness of the creature. But also the purpose of self-glorification, of which He as the most glorious and majestic One Himself was not in need, is also a free decree of His will as well as the purpose of making known His love. The Holy Scriptures also designate the creation and the redemption as a work of divine love, but also they refer all in the last instance to the glorification of God and they look upon this as the ultimate purpose of creation, Comp. Ps. 19, 2; Prov. 16, 4; Eccl. 13, 5; Rom. 1, 19–25; as well as of redemption. Comp. Matt. 5, 16; Luke 2, 14; John 7, 18; 11, 4; 14, 13; 17, 4; 21, 19; Rom. 15, 7; 16, 27; 1 Cor. 10, 31; 2 Cor. 1, 20; 4, 6, 15; Gal. 1, 5; Eph, 1, 6, 12. 14; 3, 21; Phil. 1, 11; 2, 11; 4, 20; 1 Pet. 4, 11; 5, 11; Rev. 1, 6.

Even if Fichte and after him Strauss denominated the conception of creation the fundamental error of all false metaphysics, yet to us it is the fundamental truth of all genuine faith.

TRANSFORMISM.

The late Dr. C. P. Krauth in his Introduction to *Ulrici's Review of Strauss* speaks as follows in reference to the materialism of our day:

"The lowest and the most practical of the characteristics of our day unite with some of the most brilliant and extravagant, to give to materialism a special potency. In no land is the temptation, in some of its forms, greater than our own, where material nature in her unsubdued majesty challenges man to conflict, or, in her fresh charms and munificent life, lures him to devotion. Materialism is popularized in our day. The magazines and papers are full of it. It creeps in everywhere, in the text-books, in school-books, in books for children, and in popular lectures. Materialism has entered into the great institutions of Germany, England, and America. Our old sects of orthodoxy have been invaded by it.

"Much of the materialism of our day is servile and dogmatic, implicit in credulity, and insolent in assertion. Professing to be independent of names and calling men to rally about the standard of absolute freedom from all authority, it parades names where it has names to parade, and vilifies the fame of those whom it cannot force into acquiescence or silence. Claiming to be free from partisanship, it is full of coarse intolerance. It is an inquisition, with such tortures as the spirit of our age still leaves possible. The *rabies theologorum* of which it loves to talk, pales before the *rabies physicorum* of this class, sometimes as directed against each other, yet more as directed against the men of science or of the Church, who resist their theories."

It is becoming more and more customary in our day to speak and write of Darwin's theory of the descent of man from the ape, as if it were an established fact, universally accepted by all genuine scientists and rejected only by a few theologians, who, it is asserted, are actuated by ignorance, pride or selfishness. Whilst it is true that a great many scientists are exerting their influnce in favor of Darwinism, it is nevertheless a fact that some of the foremost physicists of the age manfully oppose that theory and show by the results of their own thinking and investigations that it has not so much as a peg to hang its claims upon. Among men of this stamp Prof. Virchow holds a prominent position. "He is one of the glories of the medical faculty of the University of Berlin, first President of the German Anthropological Association, and founder of Cellular Pathology." It cannot fail, therefore, to be of interest to our readers to have the words of such a man placed before them. We have accordingly translated the following from the *Beweis des Glaubens* of December last:

"Transformism" was the theme of a lecture recently delivered by Prof. Virchow of Berlin, in which he took occasion to repeat his Munich protest against the errors so frequently made by Darwinists in drawing theoretical conclusions from certain results of paleontology and anthropology. "Practical anthropology," he said among other things, "does not begin before the quarternary or diluvial period, from which in reality skulls and parts of skeletons have come down to us, although not quite so many as have been described, but still a not insignificant number. What do these remains teach us? Do they show us man in a lower stage of bodily development not otherwise known? There was a time when in many places, with a species of fanaticism, diluvial skulls

were sought after and spoken about. It would require too much time to set forth the history of all the investigations of the skulls from the Engis and the Neanderthal to the lower jawbone from the Schipka cave. The essential part is that even the fanatics were satisfied if they could make the character of these skulls approximate to the type of the Australians or of the inhabitants of Terra del Fuego, or even of the *Batavus genuivus*, that is of an ancient Friesian. The difference between this and what had been expected is very great. An Australian may have various defects or excessive developments about him which give him somewhat of an animal expression. Formerly this was called bestial, but latterly, in the interest of the theory of descent, it has been thought better to call it pithecoid. But however bestial and however pithecoid the Australian may be, he is still neither an ape nor a proanthropos; on the contrary, he is a true man, and even if our ancestors were once constituted in the same manner, which, be it remarked in passing, is doubtful, the fact would be quite irrelevent to the theory of descent. Fuegians have recently come to us, we have learned to know them, some of them have even been examined with the utmost care, and it has been shown that the methods which we have thus far employed have not even sufficed to establish essential differences between those people and Europeans. The fact that otherwise they were savages, or it the other term be preferred, barbarians, must not prevent us from acknowledging their true human character. Suffice it to say, the diluvial people, so far as we know anything about them, had no less perfect an organization than those of the present. Since we have, in recent years, seen Esquimaux, Tchutchis, Araucanians and Kirgliez in Europe, since at least specimens of all the races designated as the lowest have been brought

to us, it is out of the question that any new variety of people now existing must be regarded as a connecting link between man and any animal whatsoever." P.

THE INDEBTEDNESS OF THE GERMAN LANGUAGE TO LUTHER.

In the eyes of loyal Roman Catholics there was nothing great and good in Martin Luther. By foregone conclusion, he must have been in every way a bad man. Religiously a heretic, morally corrupt, and a good-for-nothing fellow in all other respects—such was Luther; and it seems to do their hearts good so to picture him, or so to have him pictured to themselves. Nevertheless, they are not at ease; Luther dead and buried seems to trouble them as much as ever he did when living. What troubles them is that the Reformer is still present and active among men by means of his words and works, and then, that other people will not see Luther and judge him as Roman Catholics do. And hence they continue by misrepresentation and lying to combat his doctrine, to vilify his character, and to decry his work generally, wherever an opportunity to do so presents itself to them. Not only is this done in ponderous works of "history" and in popular works of narrative and description, but in every newspaper of the land if such papers can in any way whatever be induced to lend itself to the nasty work. Let the praises of Luther be sounded in any column of the secular press, and the editor is almost certain to receive a protest from some devout Romanist, if not a "rejoinder" or "correction" from some priest of the "holy church"—always

provided the priest, or some neighboring priest, is able to write a "rejoinder."

And it is not only Luther the man of the Church that stirs up the ire of papists; Luther the man of letters also comes in for a share of their hatred and detraction. When lately a "professor of German" in a lecture spoke of Luther as the father of that language, and this was reported in the leading German paper of the place, the "correction" sent in to that paper was so emphatic that the poor "professor" became frightened and in his fright made public statement that he did not exactly mean what he had said.

The merits of Luther as regards the German language are of late years questioned by many people; his friends and followers should stand up for him also in this matter, and in order to do so, acquaint themselves with the facts in the case. To this end their attention is called to the subjoined article taken from the *The Nation* (of New York). Considering the high character of *The Nation* as a critic in questions of philology the reader will find the criticism about as interesting and important as is the book reviewed.

"*Von Luther bis Lessing. Sprachgeschichtliche Aufsaetze von Friedrich Kluge. Strassburg: Karl J. Truebner.* 1887.

Prof. Kluge, author of the well-known etymological dictionary, here gives us, in brief compass and very readable form, the results of his own careful examination of an interesting and much mooted question of German philology, namely, the precise indebtedness of modern literary German to Luther and the Reformation. The prevailing tendency has long been to date the new High German standard language from Luther, and to regard him as the creator of it. In opposition to this view, Scherer dated the new language from about 1650, and ascribed the epoch-making influence

to the grammarians Schottel and Gottsched. He regarded Luther as simply a prominent figure in what he called the 'period of transition' from Middle to High German, that is the period from 1350 to 1650. Other writers besides Scherer have also endeavored to weaken the prestige of Luther as the creator of modern German. Brandt observes, in his Grammar, that 'Luther's share in the establishment of the written language is generally not well stated and often overrated,' and further calls attention to the fact that fourteen translations of the Vulgate Bible had been published in High German previous to the year 1518. The work before us, although a mere pamphlet, gives all the data necessary to enable the reader to form an independent judgment with regard to the matter at issue. It is based upon a careful study of old and long-forgotten points that have been exhumed from public libraries here and there, and are now made to shed their peculiar light upon the linguistive condition of the sixteenth century. The essays are not controversial in tone, but their whole tenor goes to show that the language now universally known as 'German' really is, from an historical point of view, what Grimm called it, a Protestant dialect; and also that the influence of Martin Luther in giving shape to this dialect can hardly be overestimated. We must content ourselves here with indicating very briefly the general course of Kluge's interesting argument.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century there were three great obstacles to be overcome before anything like a national German language could start into existence. In the first place there was the supremacy of the Latin as the language of the Church and of scholarship. The cosmopolitan character of the Church seemed to require an inter-

national language, and the Latin not only served this purpose, but had also become in some sense the symbol of the Church's historical dignity. Thus the Church cast its influence in favor of the use of Latin for all literary purposes, and endeavored to foster the idea that the mother-tongue was not only vulgar and barbarous, but not comparable with the Latin as a means of expressing thought. How persistent and rigorous this opposition was, Kluge's quotations show conclusively. When, accordingly, the Wittenberg agitation began, it was Luther's language as well as his ecclesiastical views that drew upon him the hostile attention of the Church. And the Reformer threw down the gage of linguistic battle as boldly as he had that of the battle theological. There is evidence that he fully foresaw the immense advantage that would come to his cause by connecting it with the use and advocacy of the mother-tongue. Who can estimate the importance of the fact that the protest of the Wittenberg priest was thus allowed by the Church to take on more and more the aspect of a quarrel between the German people, the German heart, the German tongue, and a Latin-speaking priesthood directed from Rome? How distinctly and strongly the cause of Protestantism became identified with that of the German language appears from the statistics of book-making for the early part of the sixteenth century. In 1512 there were 140 books printed in German; in 1513, 90; in 1514, 110; in 1515, 150; in 1516, 110; in 1517, 80 (it was on October 31, 1517, that the theses were nailed on the church-door at Wittenberg); in 1518, 150; 1519, 260; in 1520, 570; in 1521, 620; in 1522, 680; in 1523, 935; in 1524, 990. The history of Catholic opposition to the nascent national language is fully traced by Kluge. The last point to be surrendered was in regard to the use of the final

e in such words as Blume, Krone. Even as late as 1782 a Catholic organ could still complain: Es klang doch ehemals so genuinkatholisch die Seel, die Cron, die Sonn, die Blum, u. s. w.—und nun schreiben die unsrigen fast durchgængig die Seele, die Krone, die Sonne, die Blume—wie die leibhaften Ketzer auch schreiben.

The second of the obstacles referred to above lay in the existence of numerous highly differentiated dialects. Tenacious local prejudices had to be overcome, and it was a long time before even Protestants in various parts of the empire could persuade themselves to write the language of Luther instead of their own local speech. During the entire sixteenth century comparatively little progress was made. The early reprints of the Bible contained glossaries in which words of Luther were explained in terms of the local vernacular. Among all the literary dialects, that of Zwingli and the Swiss reformers was most tenacious of life, though it was never a formidable competitor for the honor of becoming the standard literary idiom. Such a competitor did exist, however, in the official language (Kanzleisprache) of the Emperor Maximilian, which was in a fair way to become a generally accepted standard when its progress was checked by the dialect of the Reformation. What Kluge has undertaken to do is to follow the fortunes of Luther's language during the period in which it was becoming generally accepted as the literary standard; to recount in a somewhat popular form, and without going too much into philological details, the struggle of the new idiom with the Catholic church, the dialects, and, later, with the Latinizing tendencies of the humanists. C. H. L. S.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VIII. APRIL, 1888. No. 2.

THE VII. ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

(FIRST PAPER.)

The German and Latin texts of this Article are not exact parallels; but being of equal authority, the one may be used to supplement the other. For convenience, both are subjoined together with their translations.

„Es wird auch gelehrt, daß allezeit müsse eine heilige christliche „Kirche sein und bleiben, welche ist die Versammlung aller „Gläubigen, bei welchen das Evangelium rein geprediget und „die Sakramente laut des Evangelii gereicht werden.

„Denn dieses ist genug zu wahrer Einigkeit der christlichen Kir„chen, daß da einträchtiglich nach reinem Verstand das Evan„gelium geprediget und die Sakrament dem göttlichen Wort „gemäß gereicht werden. Und ist nicht noth zu wahrer „Einigkeit der christlichen Kirchen, daß allenthalben gleich„förmige Ceremonien, von den Menschen eingesetzt, gehalten „werden, wie Paulus spricht Eph. 4, 5. 6: Ein Leib, ein „Geist, wie ihr berufen seid zu einerlei Hoffnung eures Berufs, ein Herr, ein Glaub, ein Taufe."

It is also taught, that at all times there must be and remain one holy Christian Church, which is the assembly

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME VIII.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
THE LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN.
1888.

INDEX TO VOLUME VIII.

No. 1.

The Necessity of Good Works, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 1

Protestant Church Problems in Germany, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 24

The Doctrine of Creation, translated by Rev. L. H. Schuh..... 35

Transformism, by Prof. A. Pflueger..... 57

The Indebtedness of the German Language to Luther, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 60

No. 2.

The Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 65

The Jesuits, by Prof. G. H. Schodde..... 97

Hermeneutical Principles, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 107

Infant Baptism, translated by Prof. A. Pflueger..... 122

No. 3.

The Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 129

Recent Research in Bible Lands, by Prof. G. H. Schodde..... 157

Home Mission on Sunday, translated by J. H. Kuhlmann..... 168

No. 4.

Hermeneutical Principles, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 193
The Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 213
The Position and Task of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, etc. translated by Rev. J. H. Schneider..... 226

No. 5.

Hermeneutical Principles, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 265
The Church Council, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 280
Life Insurance, by Prof. A. Pflueger 296
The Relation of Good Works to Justification, translated by Rev. L. H. Schuh..... 317

No. 6.

Discipline Commended, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 329
Conscience, by Prof. J. M. Hantz 344
An Essay on Baptism, based on Romans 6, 3–4, by Rev. S. Schillinger 360
The Errors of Judaism in Christ's Day..... 381

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VIII. APRIL, 1888. No. 2.

THE VII. ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

(FIRST PAPER.)

The German and Latin texts of this Article are not exact parallels; but being of equal authority, the one may be used to supplement the other. For convenience, both are subjoined together with their translations.

„Es wird auch gelehrt, daß allezeit müsse eine heilige christliche „Kirche sein und bleiben, welche ist die Versammlung aller „Gläubigen, bei welchen das Evangelium rein geprediget und „die Sakramente laut des Evangelii gereicht werden.

„Denn dieses ist genug zu wahrer Einigkeit der christlichen Kir„chen, daß da einträchtiglich nach reinem Verstand das Evan„gelium geprediget und die Sakrament dem göttlichen Wort „gemäß gereicht werden. Und ist nicht noth zu wahrer „Einigkeit der christlichen Kirchen, daß allenthalben gleich„förmige Ceremonien, von den Menschen eingesetzt, gehalten „werden, wie Paulus spricht Eph. 4, 5. 6: Ein Leib, ein „Geist, wie ihr berufen seid zu einerlei Hoffnung eures Berufs, ein Herr, ein Glaub, ein Taufe."

It is also taught, that at all times there must be and remain one holy Christian Church, which is the assembly

of all believers, among whom the Gospel is purely proclaimed and the Sacraments are administered according to the Gospel.

For this is sufficient to the true unity of the Christian Church, that with unanimity according to its pure sense the Gospel be preached and the Sacraments be administered in conformity with the divine Word. And it is not necessary to (the) true unity of the Christian Church, that uniform ceremonies, instituted of men, be everywhere observed, as Paul says, Eph. 4, 5. 6. (4–5): "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism."

"Item docent, quod una sancta ecclesia perpetuo man-
"sura sit. Est autem ecclesia congregatio sancto-
"rum, in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte
"administrantur sacramenta.

"Et ad verum unitatem ecclesiae satis est consentire de
"doctrina evangelii et administratione sacramento-
"rum. Nec necesse est ubique esse similes tradi-
"tionas humanas, seu ritus aut ceremonias ab ho-
"minibus institutas. Sicut inquit Paulus: 'Una
"fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus et Pater omnium,
"cet.'"

They also teach, that one holy Church is to remain continuously. The Church however is the congregation of saints in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered.

And to the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, or rights and ceremonies instituted by men, be

alike everywhere. As Paul says: "One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all," etc.

To arrive at a correct analysis and from this at a right understanding of the Article, it is necessary first of all to get into the clear on the logical character and scope of its wording. In this regard it will be readily admitted that the language employed at least contains, if it does not throughout its entire rendering constitute a definition; and then, that what is intended is a definition of the Christian Church. Its subject is, "Concerning the Church," — Von der Kirche, De Ecclesia—and it makes it a point to state what the Church is, and what are some of its most prominent properties, etc.; so that about the general drift of the Article there can be little if any dispute. It is true that the question at the head of the following VIII Art. seems to contradict this view, but the article itself establishes it; for the question, What is the Church? — Was die Kirche sei? Quid sit Ecclesia?—is here answered only indirectly and by way of introduction to another subject, and one not at all suggested by the question heading it, to wit: the efficacy of sacramental ministrations when performed by the godless. Moreover, the incidental answer here given to the question propounded is the same as that of Art. VII, only intensified and more explicit in a certain direction. Nevertheless, Art. VII. furnishes a more direct answer to the question proposed by the eighth, and one that is more satisfactory because fuller, than that given by the latter itself. Proceeding on the general assumption that Art. VII. purposes a definition of the Christian Church, other and more perplexing problems at once present themselves, and such as must be disposed of before an examination into the more exact sense of the words in hand can be entered on. They may be stated as

follows: Is the definition the Confession here gives to be taken as a description of the Church as it should be or as it is? In either case, is it spoken of with reference simply to its inner and invisible side of existence, or also with reference to its outer and visible side? Then, is the definition, whatever its particular subject may be, a simple or an extended one—in other words, is it what is called an essential or is it an accidental definition? Again, does the Article aim at something more than a definition of the Church, and of the Church only? If so, then what other thing or things are meant to be described? These questions, it will be observed, are not strictly exclusive; but they are thus formulated and divided, in order clearly to set forth the salient points involved in the general premises.

When now it is stated that the Christian Church is the "congregation" or "assembly of *believers*," and that in that congregation — Latin version—or among these believers—German version — the means of grace are "*rightly*" or "*purely*" administered, it becomes apparent at once that the Confession aims to define the Church in its ideal or normal condition of being. This is what might have been expected; for it is the common rule among men in the abstract definition of things to describe them in their constitutional perfection and not, as they may be and generally are, in their impaired or mutilated condition. The VII. Article naturally follows the common rule. It may be objected however that if the Church in its integrity is meant to be described, how can perpetuity be ascribed to it, since it is well known that the Church has not always been, is not now, nor is ever likely to be, what it should be according to its ideal? To this it may be answered, first, that the Article does not say that the Church in its full integrity "at all

times must be and remain;" moreover, and this will be shown farther on, that the Article is not intended to be a strict and simple definition merely of essentials.

The same words that have thus served to clear up the point raised by the first question, give answer also to the second; for it is evident that when the Confession designates believers as the constituent element of the Church, that it must mean the Church invisible; but again, that when it closely connects with this congregation or with these believers the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments, it becomes just as evident that the Church is contemplated also as it manifests itself. Moreover, that the Church as well in its visible as invisible aspect is spoken of, is put beyond all doubt by the reference at the end of the Article to human traditions, rites and ceremonies—things which lie altogether beyond the sphere of the Church invisible.

The third question is readily answered; for whereas an essential definition pertains only to the entity of the thing defined, and is, within this sphere, limited to essential constituents even to the exclusion of essential attributes, it becomes clear on a single glance at the Article that such a definition is not designed by it; and hence, that the definition it gives must be classified as belonging among the accidental ones. But this suggests the fourth and last of the questions propounded above: Does the Article confine itself to an extended definition of the Church? Certainly not, unless the term definition be so widened as to include, be it an explanation or a definition of something that is indeed related to the object defined but yet is so far removed from it as to enter into it neither as a constituent part nor as one of its attributes or properties. Now when the second para-

graph opens with the words: "For this is sufficient to the true unity of the Christian Church," it is seen at once that the subject has been changed: the subject is no longer the Church, nor is it an essential property of the Church, but it is the things necessary to an essential property of the Church, namely, to its unity. The second paragraph may accordingly be considered either as an explanation accompanying the definition of the Church, or as a second definition and one that treats of a matter most closely connected with the Christian Church.

Following the latter view of it, as the most natural and practical one, the Article resolves itself into two parts; that is, each paragraph becomes a proposition by itself, the one being a definition of the Christian Church, including the mentioning of the Church's properties and marks; whilst the other is a definition of the things necessary to the Church's unity.

PROPOSITION I.

The first paragraph, a) *defines the essence of the Christian Church;* b) *makes mention of its essential properties; and* c) *names the means and marks by which the Church is or may be known.*

Ad. a. The Christian Church "is the assembly of all believers"—"is the congregation of saints." Here then is a brief, precise and clear statement of what constitutes the Church of Christ in its essence and essential existence. The words "assembly," "congregation," employed to designate the generic character of the Church, may under first impressions be felt as being somewhat weak and unsatisfactory, inasmuch as they fail to point out the organic nature of the object denoted by them. But in this regard it may be observed in the first place, that the terms are suggested by the word the

Scriptures themselves use to designate the Church, and that they are intended to be, as nearly as possible, the radical verbal equivalents of the term ἐκκλησία, signifying a meeting of men brought together by call or proclamation. Wherever, therefore, the former expressions are held to be radically inadequate, the latter will certainly be objected to also. In the second place, the terms "assembly" and "congregation" are not the whole of the definition, and hence the question is, whether what may be lacking in them is not otherwise supplied. The Confession does not say that the Church is any assembly or an assembly merely, but that it is the assembly of believers, or the congregation of saints. And bearing in mind that the entire sentence, and not one or the other word of it, is intended as the equivalent of the Scripture's ecclesia, and so considering it, it will be found to state exactly what the Church designed of God, founded on Christ and built up by the Holy Ghost really is.

To set forth clearly the sense of the statement as also the more important truths directly involved in it, that method of interpretation is best which follows the order of the Church's genesis, that is, the one that begins with the individual members and thence leads over to the body collective. Now the Church, according to the Article, is made up of believers; not of men who are believers accidentally, but who must be believers in order to constitute the integral and essential parts of the Church, so that this is composed of men considered in the capacity of believers. Then, that, when Christians speak and the Christian Church is the subject, Christian believers are meant when believers are spoken of, is a matter so obvious that it must seem almost superfluous to call attention to it. But and if the Church is constituted of believers, as the Confession declares, or of those

who have the faith in Christ and of them as having this faith, then is the Church thereby characterized as in its essence a spiritual, invisible, living and organic entity—as an entity essentially spiritual, because faith is an action and a habitus entirely of the heart or of the inner man; invisible, because faith is as such not discernible by the senses; living, because faith is in itself life and has life for its substance; and, lastly, essentially organic, because the living God is the common source and object of this faith, and hence also on account of the affinity of the faith in the one to the same faith in all the other members.

Members; for from this last consideration it appears that what in view of the subject elements in the predicate —"assembly," "congregation"—might simply be called parts or persons, should, in view of the adjective element—"of believers," "of saints"—be called members. If then, as by right it must be, it is admitted that the terms "assembly" and "congregation" do not give direct expression to the organic character of the Church, it should at the same time be acknowledged that this its vital feature is at least directly involved in the terms "believers" and "saints." Since the same faith-life courses in the hearts of all who constitute the assembly or congregation, the persons assembled are related as are members to members; and therefore is the assembly or congregation of them all produced by that faith, properly speaking, a body. So again, since this common faith-life is by all derived from the same source, even from Christ the Son of the living God, therefore is He the Head of this body; "the Church, which"—as the Scriptures say—"is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all." Eph. 1, 23. Comp. Rom. 12, 5; 1 Cor. 10, 17; C. 12, 20. and Eph. 5, 23. "I believe," says Luther

whose relation to the authorship of the Augsburg Confession is well known, "that there is a holy little flock or congregation on earth, made up only and wholly of saints who are put under one *head*, Christ, being called together by the Holy Ghost in one faith, mind and soul; they possess manifold gifts, yet are they one in love and without divisions and schism. Of that I also am a part and *member*, possessed and partaking of all the treasures it has; and I was brought to it and *incorporated* into it by the Holy Ghost through this that I have heard, and do still hear, the Word of God, which (hearing) is the way of entering it." Erl. Ed. XXI. p. 103. In this same place and on the page preceding, Luther also remarks that the Church were best called simply **eine heilige Christenheit**, a holy Christendom or holy Christian people. Luther's view of the Church as the body of Christ is everywhere apparent when he speaks of it in the proper sense of the term; and the fact is that every conception of the Christian Church which fails to take note of it as of something organically constructed and full of life, is essentially incomplete; and besides, it deprives men of a great many precious truths, as witness the Scripture passages referred to above. Lastly, that the result thus arrived at is correct and in full accord with the views entertained by the authors of the Confession in regard to the fundamental nature of the Church, is established by the words of the Apology on this Article in particular. There attention is called expressly to the fact that Christ is the Head and that the Church is the body, as St. Paul says, Eph. 1, 22.

Not less vital than this last, and in some respects even more important, is the spiritual feature of the Church's entity. It is well known, that in pre-Reformation times the Church had become sadly secular, that it had degenerated

almost to a mere external institution analagous to that of the State, and that the general conception of the Church was not much better than was its sad realization. More than that: even to this day do the Romanists hold the Christian Church to be essentially an external polity, differing from the governments of the earth only in this that it pursues different ends by somewhat different means and methods. It draws a distinction between the essence of the Church of Christ on earth and the essence of the Church of Christ in heaven; it considers the former as the vestibule or hall-way to the latter, which only is the real building. Hence, to be in and of the Church on earth does not mean to be in and of the Church in heaven—at best, to be a member of the Church as it is, here means, to be on the way to the Church above. The distinction which Rome would thus establish between the two, is quite radical; it is one not of degree merely but of kind. To constitute a man a member of the Church not faith in Christ is said to be necessary, but subscription to the principles promulgated by the dignitaries of the Church, and unfailing obedience to their commands. That with such tenets at its foundation, a woeful secularization of the Church and a shameful profanation of things holy, are the inevitable consequences, this the entire history of the Church built and building on those tenets go to show.

Now there can be but little doubt that Luther, when in the affairs of God and the soul he was met by stern authority when he felt that grace and suasion alone should have ruled, and galled by such tyranny was led to examine into the principles at the bottom of it, thus discovered them to be utterly false*; yes, and that the Church itself as it

* Paper-walls he somewhere aptly calls the doctrines with which the papists endeavored to defend their notions of ecclesiasical authority.

existed in the conception and in the reality at his time, was not the Church of Christ but a miserable caracature of it. Of the Church properly conceived he writes as early as 1520, and hence ten years prior to the presentation of the Augsburg Confession: "The Scriptures speak of the Christian Church—Chriſtenheit—in a very simple way, and in but one sense to which men have added two others. The way the Scriptures speak of it is, that the Christian Church — Chriſtenheit—is the assembly of all Christian believers—Chriſtgläubige — on earth; as also we pray in the Creed: I believe in the Holy Ghost, (and) the Communion of Saints. This Congregation or assembly consists of all those who live in the true faith, hope and love; therefore, its essence, life and nature do not consist in a *bodily* gathering of the hearts in one faith; as also Paul says, Eph. 4., 'One baptism, one faith, one Lord.' And hence, though they—the members—be apart a thousand miles as to their bodies, yet are they a communion in the Spirit, because every one of them preaches, believes, hopes, loves and labors just as do the others .... This is, properly speaking, a spiritual unity, and by reason of it these people are called a congregation of saints. And such unity alone is sufficient to constitute a Christian Church—eine Chriſtenheit; and never is such a Christian Church constituted either of place, time, person, work, or of any such thing whatsoever..... There are among Christians many who stand in the bodily assembly and unity with them, but who by their own sins exclude themselves from the internal spiritual unity..... They who would have this Christian unity or congregation a bodily and an external one, are veritable Jews; for these likewise are expecting a Messiah, who shall at a certain place, to wit, at Jerusalem, establish an external kingdom—..... Moreover: man be-

ing made up of two natures, body and soul, he is not to be counted a member of the Christian Church in view of his body but in view of his soul, or rather, of his faith. Otherwise it might be said that the man is a more noble Christian than the woman, since the body of the former is more noble than that of the latter" .... But no, "in Christ there is neither male nor female, neither bond nor free, neither Jew nor Gentile; for as concerns the mere person they are (in Christ) all alike. But whoever excels in faith, hope and love, the same is the better Christian, and thus it becomes manifest that the Christian Church — Chriſtenheit — is a spiritual congregation or communion and that it is not to be reckoned among the bodies social or politic of this earth— weltliche Gemeinde—no more than the spirit is to be classed with the body or faith with earthly treasures."—*Against the Romanist—the Franciscan Alveld—in Leipzig.* Erl. Ed. XXVII pp. 86 etc.

From these few extracts it may be seen how clear and decided was the view Luther had of the real nature of the Church, and must have had of it from the beginning of his great work; then also, and more particularly, that he was fully aware of the interests at stake in his defense especially of the Church's spiritual nature. That his conception of the Church is the one subsequently given of it in the seventh—and eighth—Art. of the Aug. Conf., need hardly be stated; they are the same almost to the letter, as a comparison of the words used here and there will show at once. As to the far reaching importance of the point at issue just here, it may suffice to state, that, whereas the Church of Christ is an essentially spiritual body, nothing of this earth can properly enter into the substance whereof it is composed and by virtue of which it exists. Earthly treasures, human

authority, means and measures, order and organization, rites and institutions, however useful the one or the other of them may be to the Church in some way, not one of them belongs to it as an essential constituent.

It would be next in order how to discuss the Church as a body essentially invisible; but for practical purposes it is best to do this in connection with *c*), or the marks of the Church, and it is therefore deferred.

Ad. b. The properties of the Church considered thus far, are the strictly elementary and generic ones; that is, such as indicate what the Church is made up of and how it is to be classified in the all and order of things that be. Distinct from these are the specific, or such properties as determine in particular the chief qualities and powers of the Church. Having shown that the Confession, though implicitly yet quite directly, designates the Christian Church as being in kind a spiritual organic entity, it is next in place to see what by way of qualities are the virtue and worth, the extent and compass ascribed to it. In this regard, the seventh Article says that "at all times there must be and remain one holy Christian Church"—thus predicating of it: *holiness*, *oneness*, and *perpetuity*.

Before taking up these proportions for separate consideration, it may be well to state why and in what sense every one of them is essential to the Church. Speaking of a spiritual organism in the abstract, these are not what are called primary qualities, but secondary, that is, such as may and may not belong to the body in question; but when, in the concrete, the spiritual organism which is the body of Christ is spoken of, then are these qualities primary ones, that is, essential to the very being of that body, and this because they are native to and inherent in the constitutional ele-

ments of that body. Hence, whilst for example an unholy Church is a thing readily conceived and one that may exist in reality, an unholy Church or body of Christ is, to thought and in fact, a something that can absolutely not be. It is just as impossible to conceive of an unholy body of Christ as it is to conceive of an unholy Christ of God; the one no less than the other is a *contradictio in adjecto.*

Another preliminary question that may be asked here is, whether the triple predicate of the Article is exhaustive, or nearly so. In view of the many "glorious things" spoken of God's Zion, both in the book of God and by His people, it might seem that the description of it here is far from being complete. On close examination, however, it will be found that the three properties mentioned are intensively and extensively very significant. Taking them in the order in which they are named above, and specifying them as to their general import, it will be seen that the first is ethical, the second quantitative, and the third potential, or one that expresses the power of resistance and duration. The leady categories of quality and condition, of quantity and relation, as also of time and place and action, are all referred to: what and how much is said of the Church in its aspect of the one or the other of them, remains to be seen.

To ascertain on what grounds and in what sense holiness is predicated of the Church, reference must be had, first, to Articles 2—5 of the Confession, and secondly to the explanation the Apology gives of this, the seventh Article. According to the former, no one is holy by nature and no one becomes holy by any power and effort of his own; but, on the other hand, men become righteous before God by grace on account of Christ and through faith in Him. It is then farthermore declared that by the means of the Gospel and

Sacraments God bestows on men the Holy Ghost, and that by Him the faith that makes righteous before God through the merits only of Christ is enkindled ir their hearts. Reading in the light of this doctrine the statement of the seventh Article, that the Church is the congregation of believers among whom the Gospel is preached, &c., it becomes evident that the Church is declared holy because all its members have imputed to them the perfect righteousness of Christ their Head. Moreover, by the bestowal on them of the Holy Ghost and of the faith He works, there is placed in the hearts of Christian believers the principle and power of personal holiness, so that this may be taken as a second reason why the Church is called holy. A third is involved in the words, that in this (*in qua*) congregation the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered; hence, that the Church is the bearer and administrator of the means of grace—holy, therefore, because it holds in trust the substance of saving grace and ministers in holy things unto holy ends.

This same interpretation is obtained from the Apology. Here it is said that the words "one holy Christian Church" were inserted in the Confession in view of Eph. 5, 25–27, to-wit: "Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it; *that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the Word*, that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." This Scripture passage contains the doctrines of grace and redemption, of justification and sanctification, and of the means of grace—all in one; and on the strength of it, the Apology says, the Christian Church is, and is in the Confession called, a holy Church. In another place the

Apology says that the Church of Christians alone is by the Scriptures called the body of Christ. "For"—it continues—"Christ is its Head, and He sanctifies and strengthens it through His Spirit, as Paul says, Eph. 1. (22–23.), "And"—the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, v. 17—"gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, *the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.*" Thus do both Confessions — and it may be added, in full harmony with Scripture—declare the Church a holy one, because it is clad in the perfect righteousness of Christ, follows after sanctification, and constantly dispenses, as it has received, the fulness of saving grace.

Logically now, and by the teachings of both the Scriptures and the Confessions, happiness and glory stand in an immediate and inseparable connection with holiness. This being the case, every happy and glorious property belonging to the Church of Christ, though not expressed in words, is nevertheless implied in the one predicate of holiness; and the line of thought thus suggested, taken together with what has been said, is enough to show how profoundly significant and widely comprehensive is the term "holy" as applied to the Christian Church.

Its oneness, in the second place, calls attention to the Church in another and different aspect. The Christian Church is one—eine, *una*—single in number and hence an only Church; but it is a unit in number by virtue of the inherent harmony and unity of its parts. By the very nature of it, it can neither be divided into many nor become divided against itself. Then, too, is it peculiar and specific, and hence it can undergo no changes whereby its distinctive character were lost. Because the Christian Church is *ad intra* or in itself a unit and unique, therefore it is such

also *ad extra;* that is, among the things without and put in reference to them, there is no second Church nor anything that is the Church's like or equal.

But now the question is, whether this is the sense in which the seventh Article speaks of it expressly as being "*one.*" It must be admitted that the predicates eine, *una*, taken literally denote quantity and not quality. The same, however, may also be said of the substantive derivative *unitas* employed in this same Article; and yet it is clear, both from the context and from the word appositive to it in the German text, that *unitas* as the equivalent of Einigkeit is used in the qualitative sense. This goes to show that *una* at least may have been intended to denote quality as well as quantity. Whether such was really the case, can not be determined from the Article itself, at least with no degree of certainty. The subject of the Church's inner and outer unity is however by the second paragraph, introduced in a manner which would seem to indicate, not only that such unity was considered a well established and generally admitted fact, but also that attention had already been called to it in some way or other. If such really be the drift of thought, then the reference to the Church's unity can only be found in the oneness predicated of it in the beginning. Be this as it may, it is plain that the Article asserts the Church's unity and furnishes sufficient data from which it may be learned wherein that unity is held to consist.

When, in the first place, it is said that the Church is the assembly of believers, it means exactly what is said. If a man is a believer in the sense of the Confession, then is he a member of the Church; but not if he be not a believer. The German text says, "of *all* believers," and in the following eighth Article it is expressly stated that the Christian

Church is really nothing other than the assembly of all believers—*Cong. sanctorum et vere credentium*—and that hypocrites and wicked persons do not belong to it. From this it follows that there can be no second Church, all believers being gathered into the one; then, that there can be nothing like the Church of Christ, all the material without being extraneous to what is Christian and churchly; and lastly, that wherever believers are there the Church is, from which it appears that the oneness of the Church is really a factor also of its catholicity.

In the second place, what, in the sense of the Confession, constitutes the inner unity of the Church may readily be evolved from its conception of the Church as explained above; most clearly, however, may it be learned from the words of St. Paul, from which it derives its idea of such unity, and to which words it points for the support and explanation of its doctrine concerning it. Turning to Ephesians 4, it is found that Christians are there exhorted "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." This Spirit is the Holy Ghost—the Spirit of promise, of grace, of truth, of faith, of adoption, of prayer, of power and love and discipline, of glory, etc.—the Spirit of Christ, and who by Him is sent to live and reign in the hearts of all that are His. Now since the unity of which the Apostle speaks, is "of the Spirit" of Christ and a unity which Christians are to keep and therefore already possess, what other can it be than the identity in all of that knowledge and faith, and love and hope which the Holy Ghost bestows on God's people and in consequence of which these constitute the one body of the one Lord, Christ Jesus? The foundation, moreover, on which this unity is built up is the Divine Trinity, or, as stated, the One God, the One Spirit, and the One

Father—One, each in Himself and One with each other, the One God. Such then is, briefly explained, the unity of the Christian Church as taught by St. Paul; and to his view of it the seventh Article appeals as its own. What all is implied in this inner unity, especially in the line of churchly activity—then, how it is affected by errors in points of doctrine and by imperfections in the life of members—these and kindred questions belong to the second paragraph, and will therefore be discussed in connection with the second proposition.

The third and last of the properties, as enumerated, is perpetuity. This is expressed in the words: "there must always be and remain—." These words taken in their connection with the whole sentence do not mean that in every period of time there must be somewhere on earth some one holy Christian Church, but they affirm that the one and the same Church "must always be and remain." The Article knows of but one Church, and of this it predicates an uninterrupted existence, or perpetuity. The sense entire of these words, therefore, is really a double one: they assert the essential immutability of the Church of Christ and its unbroken existence throughout all time. The Church that was, say, in the times of Christ, and His disciples, and the Church of the present are not two Churches; no, the Church of to-day is the Church of those days and of all the past. The Lord has founded only one Church; and this He has founded once and once for all time. Hence His words to Simon: thou art Peter—Petros—, and upon this rock—Petra—I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou

shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. 16, 18-19. Paul indeed says: "According to the grace of God which was given unto me, as a wise master-builder I laid a foundation"—but this he explains by adding:" For other foundation can no man lay than that *which is laid*, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 3, 10–11. The Foundation of the Church is laid, and is laid by God Himself; and when, in another sense through the instrumentality of men, He lays this same Foundation at another time in the hearts of individuals, it means that these are placed upon the Foundation of the Church "which is laid," or in other words, that these are added to the one and only building already existing and whereof Christ is the Foundation. The edifice—to preserve the figure—is the house and temple of God, and this is essentially one and the same throughout all the ages following its creation; but during all this time the act of building has continued, so that now the same edifice extends widely over the earth and far up into heaven. The Church on earth and the Church in heaven are one. By the use of its keys —and they are "the keys of heaven"—to the binding and loosing of its doors, the one to the impenitent and the other to the penitent, the edifice on earth is built up; and by it the edifice in heaven, because of their essential identity and substantial oneness, is built up at the same time. This wonderful house of God is always building; and it is ordained of God that it be so as long as time shall furnish material that can be fitted for it; and therefore the Master's assurance, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, pertains to both the edifice and its building.. What a comfort to those who are of this house of God, whether they consider themselves as lively stones in some parts of its structure, or as builders of it together with God and under Him!

"By Ecclesia"—says Luther while speaking of the subject "is meant the holy Christian People which was not only at the time of the apostles, who have passed away long ago, but is unto the end of the world. Thus there is on earth evermore living a Christian Holy People, in whom Christ lives, operates and governs *per redemptionem*, through grace and forgiveness of sin; and in whom the Holy Ghost *per vivificationem et sanctificationem*, through daily purging out of sin and the renewing of life has His work likewise." xxv. 355. So again and in another place, he writes: "The words, 'the Comforter, even the Spirit of truth, abideth with you, and I will not leave you desolate,' John 14, 16 etc. give to the Christian Church (the assurance) and the strong comfort of Christ, that it shall not be without the Holy Ghost till the end of the world: so that we can and should be certain that the Holy Ghost shall always and forever abide on earth there to possess and preserve His own Christian Church; as also we say in the Creed . . . . For as Christ our Lord abides and is believed on in the world till its end, so likewise the Holy Ghost . . . . Nor shall the Christian Church perish as long as the world stands . . . . And we do well to heed these words of our Lord; for it is a most difficult thing to believe what these words really say and proclaim, because there are so very few people who are Christians and with and in whom the Holy Ghost abides and dwells, so that to assert it is considered a lie by everybody. And not only are the Christians few, even these few have the Holy Ghost in such weakness and in such beggarliness withal that in view of their weaknesses they are almost led to doubt their own possession of Him. How very needful then that they be thus strongly assured that the Holy Ghost is ever present with the Church since the days of the

apostles, to-day and evermore." xlix p. 162. "It is a comfort indispensable to Christians that they doubt not that the Christian Church ever remains in the world even amidst infidels, Turks, heathens, Jews, heretics, schismatics, yes even amidst the devils and his angels." Ib. p. 220.

The substantial identity of the Church on earth with that in heaven, which, as has been shown, is implied in the perpetuity taught by the Confession, contains another strong consolation and one that is most fruitful of good to Christians. The body on earth is destined for heaven; and so is every true and faithful member. There is nothing enjoyed by those who have gone before and reached the goal, but what those remaining have a title to already: it only remains for these to move onward and upward, as the Captain of their salvation would lead them, in order that they too may enter on the enjoyment of the common inheritance in the home above. Wherefore, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to His great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." 1 Pet. 1, 3–5.

Before passing on to the "means and marks" of the Church, another observation is made, and one certainly not irrelevant to the subject. The Article starts out with the words, "It is taught—"; but how? obviously as an article of *faith* "it is taught" etc., so that if the word taught were supplemented or even displaced by the word "believed," no violence could be said to be done to the general sense of the Article. But why this apparent addition or change?

Simply in order to call attention to the fact that also in the sense of the Confession all that is there said of the existence, the substance and the properties of the Church of Christ, is an object of faith and not of sight. That the Church is, what it is, how it is constituted, and what is its nature—all these are facts derived from the Word of God, and believed and taught on its evidence alone. This is, because the objects they pertain to are all spiritual and therefore also invisible and everlasting. "We"—i. e. we believers, says the Apostle St. Paul—"look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." 2 Cor. 4, 18. It follows that if the Church were not also everlasting, neither would it be spiritual nor an object of faith; therefore is its perpetuity throughout all time and throughout the endless ages beyond, a part of the ground on which the Christian says, as he does in the Creed: "I *believe*—the holy Christian Church, the communion of saints."

Ad. c. In the controversy concerning the visibility and invisibility of the Church, the Article occupies the true mediating ground between the materialism notably of the Romish Church on the one hand and the spiritualism of certain Protestant sects on the other. Against the former it urges the inner spiritual side of the Church's existence as the essential one; against the latter it maintains the outer earthly side as the formal one. The spiritual is the substantial and eternal, the earthly is the exhibitive, structural and temporal side of the one and the same Church of Christ. Against Rome, as has been shown, it is denied that the Church, even on earth, is in substance anything other than a spiritual and therefore invisible body—that body of

saints of which the all and ever present Christ of God, both according to His divine and human nature, is the Head; and to whom, by the life of His own Spirit, all His believers are joined as the living members, and thus being in Him and having by Him come to the Father, they have fellowship with God and in all the graces and treasures of God. This is the Church in its entire substance, even here on earth already; and this must be insisted on against all materializing tendencies wherever found.

But the Church in its entire substance is one thing, and the Church in its entire being and manner of being here on earth is another. Its members indeed are saints, but saints gathered from among men and still dwelling in the body of this present life; they are as yet in this earth, are of God Himself put into relation to it and charged with a mission with regard to it. Moreover, both as men and saints, they are subject to the law of the Creator by which all life will manifest itself, and manifest itself in consistency with its own nature. Accordingly, the faith-life of Christ's believers will press for utterance: their unity of Spirit, for example, will result in unions, external and visible unions, and these again in an active fellowship and co-operation manifest to the world. In a word, that the one Church gives birth to many churches, and that the invisible operates by visible agencies—these are facts as natural and necessary as they have become real and historic. And thus God would have it to be; for the Scriptures make mention repeatedly and approvingly of churches as well as of the Church. To this latter the former stand related, generally speaking, as its homogeneous parts; and these, held together within by the bond of one common faith, have from the earliest times of the Church's existence entered into as-

sociation more or less formal also externally, as may be seen from the assembly convened at Jerusalem, and from others since.

This fundamental and thoroughly Scriptural view of the Christian Church as touching the principles underlying and directing its manifestation, mode of constitution and method of action, is the strictly Protestant one. It condemns the arbitrary withdrawal of the individual from his fellow Christians, and the stifling and silencing of the faith that is in him, as acts unnatural in the sphere of the spiritual life, and as contrary especially to that will of God of which the visible Church is the fulfillment. The anchorites and pillarists of the far past, the monkish and nunnish recluses of popedom, the separatists of Luther's and the conventiclers of Spener's day, the church-slighting and church-despising Christians, if Christians they be, of all times—by the Lutheran view of the Church they are one and all condemned as the products of a corrupt faith and as the representatives of a perverted Christian life. A visible invisible Church is taught; then, its ideal is that this Church on the visible side of its existence should in all respects reflect as nearly as possible the side invisible; and moreover, that he who is a member of the Church invisible should be and will want to be a member also of the Church visible.

The use of the double predicate, "visible invisible," needs an explanation; for either it may lead to the notion of two churches, when really there is but one, and but one is meant, or again, it may be asked, and with reason, how one and the same thing can be at one and the same time both visible and invisible. The answer to this is, that the two predicates do not apply to the Church in exactly the same way and with equal force. The Church as such and

in its essential totality is truly and literally invisible, nor does it as such ever become visible. But, as has been shown, the one Church is productive of churches,—i. e. Christian congregations—and of unions of churches—i. e. of general bodies of congregations—and in these and by them as in and by external societies this Church manifests, not itself as such and as though the spiritual body itself ever became visible, no, but the fact of its existence, as also the reality and quality of its life. In other words: in the visible churches the one invisible Church assumes a certain external form of being and mode of operation; and this, in order to work out its mission on earth and in time. And because it does so in and for time only, everything external and visible about the Church is transient and at the end of time, having served its purpose, it shall pass away. Whether the churches, in which as houses the Church may be said to live and labor as a tenant, are always and everywhere houses becoming in all respects to her who occupies them —and when?—these are questions which, as belonging to the second paragraph, are for the present passed by. In point of fact, however, there is neither a visible church nor a collection of churches that were the exact representative counterpart of the entire one holy Church of Christ; nor can there be so long as there are found unbelievers within and believers without the Church, as this is constituted on earth. Error, hypocricy and spiritual lethargy hinder the Church of Christ from representing herself in a likeness in all respects true to her own pure, upright and living self.

Turning to the seventh Article with reference to the present phase of the subject, it will be noticed that it speaks of the Church in its double aspect; that is, of the one Church which is indeed a spiritual body but which, while

on earth, assumes some tangible mode of existence and activity. Its external social, if not corporate, form of being and manner of working are there assumed to be a matter of course. That such is the case, is indicated already by the use of such terms as assembly and congregation; it becomes more evident by its reference to the administration of the means of grace, and to rites and ceremonies as factors not necessary to the churchly unity; and lastly, it is put beyond all doubt by the explanation and defense of it in the Apology where, among other things, it is expressly stated that "the Church is not merely a society of externals—Aber die chriſtl. K. ſtehet nicht allein in Geſellſchaft äußerlicher Zeichen—*At Ec. non est tautum societas externarum rerum cet.* Ed. Mueller p. 152—.It is a society of externals, but not that only; it is more, much more, still it is that too. Hence, in view of the fact that the Church contemplated in the description of it in the seventh Article, is, as it has since been termed, the visible invisible Church, it is hard to understand how it can be charged against the Confession that its Church-conception is one altogether too spiritual; so much so, it is thought, as to render it difficult to derive from it a correct idea of the Church visible. If it can be said—as it may—that special stress is laid on the Church invisible, it need only be remarked that that is no more than proper since the substance of a thing is of more importance than its form, at least in this case; besides, the Protestant apologetic character of the Confession should likewise be kept in sight. Of churchly forms there was in those days enough and more than enough, whilst of substance there was little, and this little was held in low esteem.

Of the things external to the Church, and by which it may be said to become visible in a manner and to charac-

terize itself also before men, the Article seems to say very little; nevertheless, in reality a great deal is said, in fact all that can well be said. How, for example, the Church should socially and politically constitute itself into churches and combinations of churches, such, and others of a like nature, are questions not of faith but of polity; and hence—their fundamentals excepted—belonging to the sphere of liberty, they do not properly find their answer in articles of faith. But what is necessary to the true and pure faith in whose strength the Church is designed to mark and manifest itself in the world, that the Article points out when it states that, in the Church it contemplates, "*the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered.*" This is saying a great deal in more than one phase of the subject. The Church is, and is what it is, through the Word and its use of the Word; and it is dependent on this latter both for its safety and prosperity. Moreover, from its use of the Word men may know that the Church is, and where; and also what its condition is in point of character and efficiency. To this it may be added that where the means of grace are administered as the Article would have them, there the Church's polity is sure to be a safe one, since by its doctrines of the common priesthood of all believers, of their parity, of their Christian liberty, etc., the Gospel will effectually secure the Church rightly teaching it, against the lordship of men on the one hand and against licentiousness on the other.

All this, and much besides, is comprehended in the right use of the Gospel and the Sacraments; and there can be but little doubt that the authors of the Confession were fully aware of it and well knew how much they said when to their description of the Church they added the words

under consideration. But if such be the case, then why are these particular words referred to as though they were intended to point out only the marks of the Church, or as though that were at least their chief purpose? Such an interpretation certainly fails to do them full justice. True, as the Article reads, this itself may possibly make the impression that the Gospel and Sacraments are introduced inasmuch as by their use the Church gives evidence of its existence, and so on; but supposing that such were the case, then the question arises at once: Why are just these things, rather than some others, the marks of the Church? To this the answer of the Confession itself would be: Because these things, and these alone, are the means of God to the Church's creation, preservation, extension and perfecting; for, as the fifth Article plainly declares: "Unto the obtaining of this"—justifying and therefore Church-building—"faith, God has instituted the office of the ministry, and given the Gospel and Sacraments, through which as through means He bestows the Holy Ghost" etc. Accordingly, in any case the Gospel and the Sacraments find mention in the seventh Article likewise as means, not as marks only. Thus viewed, the question is narrowed down to this —and one no longer of vital importance, to wit:—whether the Gospel and Sacraments are mention as means and as marks in co-ordination; or whether as means expressly and as marks by implication, or *vice versa.*

A pointer on this point is found in the Apology where it is said that "the Christian Church is not merely a society in external things and rites, but chiefly—*principaliter*—a society of faith and of the Holy Ghost in the hearts; but yet, that it has external marks—*externas notas*—by which it may be known, namely, the pure doctrine of the Gospel

and the administration of the Sacraments in conformity with the Gospel of Christ." Mueller p. 152. Still, this allusion to the seventh Article does not decide the question whether or not the Gospel and Sacraments are there named, be it chiefly or simply as marks and not as means. The Romish objection to the Article was that by it the Christian Church was too much, if not altogether, spiritualized; to meet it, the seventh Article is interpreted as conceiving the Church to be a society also in externals having the ministry of the Gospel and Sacraments for its marks of recognition. On the other hand, reading the Articles of the Confession in their given sequence, the most natural interpretation of the seventh will be found to be this: since faith is through the means of grace and since the Church is made up of believers, therefore is it an assembly in which the means of grace are in use. This is the primary sense. Then comes the secondary, and the one immediately involved, to wit: since the ministration of the means of grace is a public function, therefore does it mark the Church's existence, location, condition, and so on.

That such was the train of thought in the mind of the author becomes pretty clear from the fact that Luther thus looked at the matter. "Therefore,"—he wrote as early as A. D. 1517 or 18—"wheresoever the Word of God is preached and believed, there is the true faith, the immovable rock"—i. e., the petra of Matt. 16, 18.—"but where the faith is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there is the Bride of Christ, and where the Bride of Christ is, there are all the treasures of the Bridegroom." Erl. Ed. Lat. xxix. p. 335. In 1520 he wrote: "The signs from which it can be externally known where in this world the Church is, are Baptism, the Sacrament (of the Altar) and the Gospel; and

not Rome, or this or that place. For where Baptism and the Gospel are, it is not to be doubted that there are saints also, and if these were none other than the children in their cradles. But Rome and papal authority are no signs of the Church; for such authority produces no Christians as do Baptism and the Gospel; neither therefore does it belong to the Christian Church, and it is a mere human arrangement." Erl. xxvii. p. 108. Likewise in 1521 he wrote: "You ask by what sign the Church is known? and say, that there must be given some visible sign by which Christians may come together to hear the Word of God. I answer, such a sign is necessary and such we have, namely, Baptism, the (sacramental) Bread, and, above all, the Gospel. These three are the symbols, the watchword and the characteristic marks of Christians. For where thou seest Baptism, the Bread and the Gospel to be present, be the place or the persons any whatsoever, there doubt not the Church to be." "The Gospel"—he then adds—"more than the (sacramental) Bread and Baptism, is the one, and the most certain and noble symbol of the Church since the latter is originated, built up, nourished, begotten, educated, fed, clothed, beautified, strengthened, armed and preserved alone by the Word of God, and in this the Church has its whole life and substance, even as Christ says, 'Man liveth by every Word that proceedeth from the mouth of God.'" (Matt. 4, 4.). Ed. Lat. xxxi. p. 311.

This view of the means of grace as the chief marks of the Church unfortunately satisfies neither the Romanists nor all Protestants. Among the latter there are those who say that the visibility of the Church is not to be placed in the administration of the means of grace,—as in fact it is done, they say, by Luther and the seventh Article—, but in

the churches themselves as externally organized. In answer to this it may be remarked, in the first place, that neither Luther nor the Confession name the administration of the means of grace as the identity of the Church visible; but they do declare the means of grace and their administration to be such external things as evidence the reality and presence of the Church invisible, and as characterize the Church visible. And in view of this latter fact it may, in the second place, be asked, if the Church visible is the mark of the Church invisible, what external thing in the former is it that specifies it as a church? Is it the mere name, or the union of people for churchly purposes, or their profession of faith and their good works? Certainly not; for all these things are, by general admission, deceptive and unreliable. If however the means of grace are administered in a church, then may the presence of the Church in such Church be inferred with a degree of certainty not otherwise obtainable: and this on account of the divinely assured efficacy and efficiency of the means that are there dispensed.

Another objection to this position, and one also raised by Protestants now and then, is, that by this view of the matter the visibility of the Church is again fixed chiefly in the ministry; and thus they claim to see in it a tendency Romewards. But the mistake of these people is a double one. In the first place, they seem to think that Lutherans exclude from the marks of the Church everything that is not in full form a function of the public ministry—such as the professions of faith and the works of love on the part of the people—and that thus a prominence is given to the ministry, by which the laity is put in the background. Surely, such is not the case; it is nowhere claimed among Lutherans that, for example, the Christian life of the people

goes for nothing, and that it in no wise and to no extent indicates the presence of believers, and hence, of the Church of Christ; nor is the administration of the means of grace as the work of the Church anywhere among them so confined to the clergy as altogether to exclude the teaching of the Word by the people. Of course, on wrong premises, it is easy to draw all sorts of conclusions; but it will not be found so easy to account for them.

In the second place, those who come to such conclusions seem to overlook the fact that, according to the Lutheran doctrine of the ministry, the latter belongs to the whole people, and not to the clergy; and moreover, that this is an order of men possessing nothing but what belongs to the Church and the latter entrusts to them. If then to some it does look as though the ministry were exalted and the laity slighted, when the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments are declared to be κατ' ἐξοχήν the marks of the Church, in fact it is not the case, and to Lutherans it will not so appear since the work of the ministry is in truth the work of the people.

The adverbials **rein,** purely, and *recte*, rightly will be discussed in connection with the second paragraph.

C. H. L. S.

THE JESUITS.

The indications are multiplying that the controlling spirit of modern Roman Catholicism is Jesuitism. At no time since the order was restored by Pius VII. in 1814 has it been as powerful and as aggressive as at present. It is deeply significant that when Windthorst, at the recent Catholic Congress at Treves, where representatives from all

the Romish clans in Germany were present, demanded of the government the abrogation of the law expelling the Jesuits, he was cheered to the echo. An enthusiastic attendant describes this scene as one "worthy of angels and men."

There can be no doubt about it that the spirit of reckless disregard of method and means in the accomplishment of any desired end, which is the essence and genius of Jesuitism, is characteristic of the Roman Catholicism in Germany at present and is rapidly becoming the controlling power in the church of error over the whole earth. The election returns have shown that about eighty per cent. of the Roman Catholic voters of Germany sustain the radical measures of the Centre party in political and social measures. It is accordingly not correct to say that the Roman Catholic masses do not endorse the Vaticanism and Ultramontanism of their leaders in parliament and church. Indeed in this regard the strength of the leaders consists chiefly in the support of the hosts that are willing to be led. The era of good feeling which existed to a great extent in Germany between the two great religious bodies in the ante-*Kulturkampf* days is a thing of the past. It was confidently predicted before 1870 that the intelligence and honesty of German Catholics would never submit to a council decree of papal infallibility; and when that decree was announced it was announced with equal assurance that the Old Catholic movement would prevent its acceptance by the Teutonic people. The attitude of the Romanists before that day gave some grounds to expect such an issue. The authorities at Rome complained not a little about the luke-warmness of their German subjects in reference to the interests of the Roman hierarchy.

Now all this is changed and the complaint is of the

other party. When Leo XIII. concluded his *modus vivendi* with Bismarck last April, the German Roman Catholic leaders were dissatisfied with the conditions, maintaining that they would have been able to secure more favorable terms from the iron chancellor. So discontented were they that Windthorst even suppressed the first letter sent to him from Rome urging the Roman Catholics of Germany to vote for the Septennate. In his Cologne address he appealed *a Papa male informato ad papam melius informandum*, i. e., from the pope poorly informed to the pope better to be informed. The Treves congress was held partly for the purpose of emphasizing these additional claims which the politicians of the Vatican had disregarded.

These proceedings are characteristic of the new Roman Catholicism in the fatherland. Their ideals are those of the Jesuits, namely, the extreme exaltation of the church as a theocratico-political hierarchy and as the controlling factor in the religious political and indeed the entire public and private life of the nations. Their methods, too, are those of the Jesuits. To attain their ends they plan and work and vote with social democrats, anarchists and other revolutionary political parties. Any and all means are fair if only the object in view can be gained. The ups and downs of the *Kulturkampf* are instructive in this line.

There is probably no more typical representative of this spirit than Janssen's *Geschichte* of the German people since the close of the Middle Ages. His object is to show that the Reformation was a sad calamity for Europe; that it has been the fountain-head of all the misfortunes that befel society from that day to this. The work is intended to justify Roman Catholicism before the face of history. Were the author to deal justly with facts, he would have an impossi-

ble task before him, for historical facts and his thesis could not be harmonized. He accordingly arranges his authorities, uses and abuses them in such a manner as to make yea nay and nay yea. The characteristic feature of his work is his method, and the characteristic feature of his method is his Jesuitic maltreatment of them in order to make them, *nolens volens*, hold out to his thesis. He does not write history, he manufactures it.

The recent papal jubilee has also illustrated the Jesuitic character of modern Roman Catholicism. Not the person, but the office of the pope was the subject of parade and prominence. The institution of papacy as a controlling power in the life of nations was that which was magnified, and the great importance of regaining a temporal power for the Vatican was the gospel preached to the multitudes. It was in a line with the Immaculate Conception and more particularly with the Infallibility figment of the Vatican Council. There is no tendency observable in the Roman Catholicism of our day looking toward the growth of a spiritual life of the faithful, in so far as this is yet possible to the formal religionism of that sect. The one aim and end is the glory of the hierarchy as a power controlling the destinies of nations, and therein are concentrated the ideas and the ideals of the Jesuits.

Nor are the Romanists of America actuated by a different spirit. The fact that President Cleveland, at Philadelphia, last September, considered it incumbent upon him to call upon Cardinal Gibbons on the occasion of the Centennial of the Constitution, was probably dictated primarily by private or party-political interests. But this makes the matter all the worse, if the Romanist must be recognized by the head of the nation as a prominent political factor in the land.

That it is the ambition of that church to secure this prominence no man can doubt, and that in a measure they are successful is equally certain. And farther, that this power is to be used primarily for ecclesiastical purposes and not for political ends in themselves, no observant reader of the signs of the times can hesitate to believe. The Romanists have made a decided advance during the past decade or two in securing an influence on public sentiment and public action. They preach now where twenty-five years ago they scarcely ventured to whisper. Statistics tell us that there are 1,100 Jesuit patres in America, who control 23 higher institutions of education. These figures are doubtless far too low, as there seems to be no doubt that at least 1,000 fathers came to America after their expulsion from Germany. At all events they work here for the same ends that they have in view in Europe, and to "convert" America and bring it to the feet of the pope would be their greatest glory.

Such a state of affairs makes a renewed glance at this order and its methods and aims one of considerable interest. The view often met with, that it was founded by Ignatius of Loyola, for the express purpose of rooting out the gospel church of the Reformation, is erroneous, although of all the Romish orders it is the most determined foe to the gospel cause.

The character of the founder and the occasion of its establishment are significant in regard to the character of the order. Ignatius of Loyola was a member of an ancient noble family. He was a soldier, he was ambitious, and he was a Spaniard. Each of these characteristics have indelibly left its impress upon the institution he established. As a soldier he made obedience the prime, indeed the only virtue of its membership; his ambition finds its expression in

the aggressiveness of the order; and his Spanish lack of conscientiousness explains the unscrupulousness typical of its work. The establishment was entirely the outcome of an ambitious project. Wounded at a siege, Ignatius was compelled to submit to dangerous surgical operations. When slowly convalescing he occupied his time by reading the lives of the founders of the various fraternities and orders in the Mediæval Church. He at once determined to establish an order himself that should make his name as honored and as glorious as were those of Franciscus and Dominus. The comparison sometimes made between the spiritual development of Luther and Loyola are instructive only by their contrast. The one went forth tried and cleansed in the furnace of God's law, with the purpose of restoring the truth as it is in Christ Jesus; the other meditated and studied how he could satisfy his selfish and carnal ambition. The spiritual development of these doubtless greatest leaders of the Reformation period differ as do day and night.

It was the *soldier* Loyola, who had been engaged in many a contest for the faith in Spain, who established the new order. He did not call his association "an order" but "company"; its chief leader is the "General" at Rome.

The leading principle of the society is absolute obedience to superiors. Ignatius himself declares that over against the authorities the members should be as dead bodies, i. e. move only as moved. A leading teacher of the order says this obedience is *pernide ac cadaver, vel similiter at que senis baculus,*" i. e. to be as a dead body or to be as a staff in the hands of old men. The *cadaver* obedience has become the classical expression for Jesuitic obedience. Over against the superiors, the Jesuits have practically no will, no thought, no feeling, no soul and especially no

conscience. The sum and substance of their duty is to obey, absolutely and without murmuring as a good soldier does his commander.

Another feature of the order from the beginning was that it is an independent organization. It is similar to the other societies that it enjoins certain kinds of ascetic exercises—indeed these are sometimes carried out to extremes. On the other hand it is dissimilar in this that it stands in no organic connection whatever with the hierarchy and the ramification of the hierarchical system. No Jesuit is allowed to accept an office under the hierarchy. They engage in missionary, in educational and other work, but are independent as an order in their operations. Their head is not the pope but the General at Rome. They form an institution not *of* but by the side of the great hierarchy. That the papacy could consent to the organization of such a society is owing to the fact that they were organized from the very beginning to be the soldiers of the papacy, to uphold that system, and in this work saw the object of their existence. It is a singular irony of history that in our day the servant has become the master and the master the servant. The Jesuits control the papacy, not the papacy the Jesuits. The pope may have some reason to his claim of being a prisoner. But his captors are not the Italians; they are the Jesuits.

The principles of the Jesuits have been the subject of many angry discussions, especially their principles of morals. Interpreted however in the light of their actions it would seem that even the strongest of accussations of their adversaries are well grounded and established. A number of principles are acknowledged by the society itself which are of the most damaging kind. Ranke and some other historians think that the leading objectional features are

the outgrowth of a degeneration of the society and were not in the original organization. This however is manifestly an error. As early as 1560 the Jesuitic definition of sin defines sin as only the *intentional* and *voluntary* transgression of the law of God. From the very beginning the doctrine of *reservatio mentalis* was taught and practiced by the order. According to this a promise may be made and even an oath given with the secret understanding on the part of the speaker that he means this word or oath in an entirely different sense from what the words themselves imply. The charactaristic feature of their casuistry is the determination of the permissibility of an action for the accomplishment of an end according to the principle of probability. According to this not the right and the wrong decide the virtue of an action, but the evidence in its favor gathered from their standard ethical authorities. According to this a man may perform an action for which he can cite only a single authority, even though his own conscience condemns it as wrong. The Jesuits acknowledge this as a leading principle of their ethics, but seek to excuse this by claiming that it is not original with them but is derived from older systems. A farther feature of their moral is the *methodus diregendae intentionis.* According to this it is lawful to commit a deed known to be a violation of law, if only it is the intention of the doer not to do any wrong thereby. Closely allied to the principle of the *reservatio mentalis* is that of amphiboly or ambiguity. This allows a man to use ambiguous terms for the express purpose of misleading others as to the real intentions and object.

The great rock of offence in the order's system has been the maxim that the end justifies the means, and around this angry discussions have frequently been carried on. The

Jesuits indignantly deny that this is their principle, and their opponents maintain with equal determination that it is the cardinal principle of their order. The discussion has recently been carried on in America also. It was occasioned by the address of Bishop Coxe, at the Washington Alliance Meeting, on Ultramontanism. A prominent Roman Catholic bishop offered two hundred dollars reward if any passage in an acknowledged Jesuit author could be cited to prove that at any time this maxim had been accepted by that society. The discussion has been chiefly carried on in the New York *Herald* where too the authorities are cited proving the correctness of Bishop Coxe's assertion.

It is true that the founder of the order does not *ex professo* and in so many words teach this maxim, but it is equally true that it is really implied in the principles already stated and acknowledged by the Jesuits themselves, as also that a number of Jesuit writers of high authority in the order expressly teach this nefarious doctrine.

The oldest defender of the doctrine is their standard writer Busenbaum, whose work, entitled *Medula* has gone through more than fifty editions, and by its reprint not many years ago at the press of the Jesuit Propaganda in Rome, can claim continued and solemn approval of the supreme authority of the Church, "*Cum finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita*"* are his very words. And again "*Cui licitus est fines, etiam licent media*"† (cf. pages 320. 504. Frankfort Edition of 1653.

A Jesuit luminary of the first rank is Layman, of whom Gury, the greatest of Jesuit moralists says: *Inter maximos*

*If the end is lawful the means are also lawful.

†To whom the end is lawful the means are also lawful.

theologia moralis doctores sine dubio referendus.‡ In his "Theologia Moralis" (Munich 1625) the same proposition in almost the identical formula is taught, "*Cui concessus est finis, cancessa etiam sunt media ad finem ordinata.*"§

In 1762 the Jesuit Wagemann, professor of Morals at the University of Innsbruck, published a synopsis of moral theology, duly authenticated by official approbation, in which occurs the following passage: "Is the intention of a good end rendered vicious by the choice of bad means? Not if the end be intended irrespective of the means." This proposition is exemplified in the following manner. "Caius is reminded to bestow alms, without at the same time taking thought as to the means. Subsequently, from avarice, he elects to give them out of the proceeds of a theft, which to that end he consequently commits." Hence Caius is declared entitled to the merits of charity, though he has aggravated the offence of violence by the mode of avarice. Wagemann clearly states his underlying principle in these words: "*Finis determinat probitatem actus*"¶—a definition of neat preciseness.

Father Voit is another of the shining stars of Jesuit morals. In his "Moral Theology" (Paris, 1843, p. 99), he puts it in this shape: "Arcadius kills Caius in some city where the law inflicts capital punishment on a murderer. Arcadius is delivered up and condemned to death; but he escapes, forcibly breaking out of prison, though foreseeing that he may render his jailors liable to grievous injury.

‡ Undoubtedly he must be regarded as among the greatest in moral doctrine.

§ To whom the end is lawful to him also the means to attain this end is lawful.

¶ The end determines the virtue of an action.

The question is whether Arcadius, by escaping after sentence had been pronounced, has done wrong. My answer is in the negative. Has Arcadius done wrong by breaking his chains and forcibly breaking out of prison? He has done no wrong; *cui enim licit finis, ei et media permissa sunt.*" To whom the end is lawful to him the means are also allowed.

Voit stands in such high estimation among his order that his propositions have been adopted almost *verbatim* by the two greatest literary luminaries of Jesuitism in our day, namely, Father Liberatore and Gury. In an essay, originally inserted in what has been proclaimed by Pius IX. the special organ of true doctrine, namely, the *Civilta Cattolica* of Rome, Father Liberatore, after an elaborate argument in support of the title of the church to press into her service the agency of physical means, thinks of strengthening his position by the maxim "that from the obligation to attain an end arises the right to procure the means needful and useful for obtaining the same." (Cf. *La Chiesa e lo Stato. p.* 185.)

Gury's Moral Theology is the standard compend in Roman Catholic seminaries, and citations from his work abound to show that he teaches the traditional wisdom of his order on this subject. Cf., also *Encyclopedia Brittanica*, 9th Edition, article Jesuits. G. H. S.

HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES.

Every pastor, in virtue of his special office as a teacher of revealed truth, is a biblical interpreter. He is called to present the Word of God to the understanding and the conscience of the people committed to his charge, and in doing this he must needs study and expound that Word. Hence

no pastor can dispense with the study of Biblical Hermeneutics. To be faithful he must use what helps are at his command to ascertain the mind of the Spirit who speaks in the Holy Scriptures. Each one may follow the dictates of his own judgment in the employment of means and methods to find the sense expressed in the words of revelation. We do not presume that any one who is mindful of the account which he has to render on the judgment day will be induced to pursue ways which his own mind does not approve. Each must answer for himself and must therefore judge and decide for himself. But there are certain general principles of biblical interpretation which are applicable to all persons under all circumstances. They are of a fundamental nature, and must be recognized at the outset by all who would successfully expound the Word of God. To these fundamental principles of Hermeneutics we propose to devote this article, and several others which are to follow, in the hope of benefiting especially the ministers, whose calling it is publicly to expound the Scriptures, but also the intelligent laity who read the MAGAZINE, and who, when they search the Scriptures daily, have need of these principles as well as the pastors. The first of the principles is

I. THE SENSE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IS CLEAR.

It is perhaps not at once apparent, without some explanation, how this should have anything to do with interpretation in general, and with Scripture interpretation in particular. Whether a statement is perspicuous or not seems to make little difference when the mode of discovering its meaning is in question. Clear or not clear, we must find out, if we can, what the author designed to say; and in finding this out it seems of little consequence whether we

assume that his language is clear or obscure. But it is of some consequence. If we assume that in the Bible we have before us a volume of perplexing riddles, we will be sure to overlook the simple sense of the words employed in our quest for some hidden meaning, and the truth which is plain will be rejected in the effort to find something more in accord with our preconceived opinions. Moreover, the assumption that the Scriptures are dark will stand in the way of their zealous study, because it will discourage with the ever recurring thought that the work is useless, since the Bible is hopelessly obscure. A Romanist, even apart from the dissuading influence of those in authority, has no incentive to search the Scriptures. Believing that they are dark and that they will remain dark to the soul in spite of all its study, he can have no assurance that the sense of the Holy Ghost has been ascertained in any case by his diligent search, even though it should seem to him that the passage studied is capable of no other meaning than that which he has found in it. Assuming that the Scripture is not clear, he remains in doubt even when it seems clear. In short, the doctrine of the obscurity of Scripture is an obstacle in the way of all honest and intelligent exegesis. As long as the truth is not accepted that the Bible is clear, there is little use for Biblical Hermeneutics. We therefore maintain the perspicuity of Scripture as a first principle of interpretation.

That the sense of Holy Scripture is clear and perspicuous, so that man can understand it and be sure of it, is certain for two reasons.

In the first place, the matter contained in our proposition all implies its truth. The Scriptures communicate the Word of God. That Word was given for our learning, that it should make us wise unto salvation. But to accomplish

this design the truth must be given in such a way that we can understand it. It would fail of its purpose if it did not clearly reveal the divine will. Such a failure could be possible only if God had not the power or had not the will to speak clearly. To say that He had not the power would be a denial of His Godhead, and would at the same time involve the absurdity of teaching that He created man and is the Author of all language, and yet that He could not, when He desired to make a revelation of His purposes and will to men, so use language as to make it perfectly intelligible to His intelligent creatures. But to say that He had not the will would be a denial of His mercy; for it would assume the existence of an alleged revelation, on the apprehension of which the soul's salvation is dependent, but which is yet so framed that it cannot be apprehended by those for whom it is intended. If our eternal happiness hangs on our knowing the truth of God, how could God in mercy desire our happiness, and yet refuse to make known the truth indispensable to this end? A revelation that is not clear would in fact be no revelation at all, and there could be no mercy in tantalizing man with a seeming gift of light that leaves all in darkness. God could give us a clear revelation, and the purpose for which He gave it required that it should be clear.

In the second place, the Scriptures expressly claim for themselves such clearness. "For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go up for us to heaven and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? But the

word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it." Deut. 30, 11–14. These words plainly show us that when God speaks to us it is in language that is easily understood. The matter contained in His communication is then not hidden from us, but is revealed; it is not far off, but brought near to us, so that it can be received into our hearts and spoken again with our mouths. And what is thus said of the commandment of God is referred to by St. Paul as embracing also the Gospel. Rom. 10, 5–8. Accordingly the whole Word of God is declared to be clear and easily understood. Furthermore it is said: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." Ps. 19, 7. 8. The sure testimony that makes the simple wise cannot be obscure and leave the reader in doubt about its meaning; the pure commandment that brings light to the eyes of men cannot itself be dark. It enlightens, converts, makes wise, rejoices, because it is the revelation of God, which shines by its own light and banishes darkness. The same truth is repeated in another psalm, where it is written: "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." Ps. 119, 105. And again: "The entrance of Thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple." Ps. 119, 130. The holy writer here declares that the words of Scripture are so clear that they serve as a lamp to illumine all our path, and that if we permit them to enter our souls they will chase away the darkness and make us wise, so that we shall walk as children of light.

That which is so plainly expressed in the Old Testament is repeated with the same directness and distinctness

in the New. St. Paul writes: "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 15. 17. The Holy Ghost thus teaches us that the contents of the Scripture may be so known that the soul becomes wise and is saved through the faith which embraces them, and that by their light and power the learner is supplied with all that is needed to bring him into conformity with God's holy will. To this end it was given by inspiration of God, that the man of God might be perfect. If it is not clear and brings no light to the darkened soul it fails of its purpose, and is *not* profitable for doctrine or reproof, for correction or instruction in righteousness. But it is clear, and is fully adequate to its design, as the words of the apostle testify. Again, St. Peter says: "We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts." 2 Pet. 1, 19. The prophetic word that is given by inspiration of the Holy Spirit is more sure than even the testimony of our senses; and it shines into the night of earth and makes all the way plain, until we shall have reached the celestial city, of which Christ, the bright and Morning Star, is the everlasting light. But how could it confer such blessings upon us if it were itself dark? It is not dark, but is a light shining in a dark place. The Holy Scriptures are clear, and clearly show the way to heaven.

But when this is maintained some remarks seem needful by way of explanation.

In the first place, when we maintain the perspicuity of Scripture we do not assert that no conditions and qualifications are necessary for understanding them. Nothing is plain where there are no eyes. God speaks clearly in His Word, but the clearly expressed truth will not be perceived where there is no intelligence to perceive anything. To understand the Scriptures we must have a knowledge of the language in which its truth is presented, a mind capable of apprehending what is clearly presented to it, and that spiritual enlightenment which is needed for the discernment of spiritual things. We do not claim that the clearness of Scripture renders the gifts of nature and of grace unnecessary to attain a knowledge of the truth. What we do claim is that there is no fault in the Word of God if people do not have the light of salvation. The Word is clear, and they who have the necessary qualifications for understanding a clear revelation can know its contents.

In the second place, we do not maintain that every word and every sentence is so clear that all dispute about the sense of any passage is impossible. Such a claim would contradict not only experience, but also the declaration of the Holy Spirit Himself, who says of St. Paul's epistles, "In which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction." 2 Pet. 3, 16. What is asserted is that everything necessary to eternal life is set forth clearly in the sacred books, so that every person qualified to understand clear language can apprehend it. If not every passage is equally clear, the truth which God designed to reveal man's salvation is so expressed that all may know it from the Scriptures. If even in regard to a point necessary to be known for our salvation a statement should

not be perfectly clear, other passages bearing on the same subject will explain it. The truth unto salvation is clearly revealed in Holy Scripture.

In the third place, we do not maintain that the clearness of the revelation does away with all mysteries by making all manifest that was incomprehensible. There are things pertaining to the Christian faith which in their very nature are above human understanding. But these mysteries too are clearly revealed. They do not by such revelation cease to be mysteries. They are set before us in the inspired word of Scripture just as distinctly as things which are not put in this category. What God designs to reveal is clearly revealed. That the objects thus revealed contain much that passes our comprehension does not depart from the clearness with which it is set before the soul through the inspired words. The thing that is a mystery is revealed to us as a mystery, and in setting this before us the Scriptures are perfectly clear, so that we can know the mysteries as God would have us know them.

When we maintain the perspicuity of Holy Scripture, then, the import of our proposition is that everything necessary for man's salvation is so clearly expressed in the words of divine inspiration that any one acquainted with the language and endowed with ordinary understanding, can, if he reads these words with attention, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit find their meaning and apprehend their contents. If people have not the necessary qualifications for understanding language that is perfectly clear, that can in no sense and in no degree detract from such clearness. That the matter contained in the revelation often surpasses the comprehension of man is no impeachment of the perspicuity with which that matter is presented in the words of

the Holy Spirit. And where there is a real difficulty in ascertaining their grammatical connection, the subject is of such a nature as to have no direct bearing on the foundation of our faith, or it is rendered perfectly clear in parallel passages which remove all doubt as to the meaning. If names of minerals or plants or animals, or words pertaining to ancient customs or arts or places, are not perfectly intellegible now, and if occasional grammatical difficulties occur in the unusual structure of a sentence, that in no wise renders the proposition doubtful, that the truth of God unto the salvation of man is clearly revealed in Holy Scripture, so that men may know it.

From the principle, that the Holy Spirit speaks clearly in the Holy Scriptures, we deduce the important hermaneutical rule, that the interpreter is not to show what might be the meaning of the words interpreted, but what their meaning is. His task is not to make ingenious guesses at the possible signification of the words, but to set forth what the Holy Spirit really meant to say and did say when He employed them. It is manifest that this must apply primarily to the very words which the Holy Spirit used, and that therefore the original text must be the ultimate standard. It is manifest also that the interpreter must be under the guidance of the Holy Spirit so as to be protected against explaining his own thoughts into the Scriptures, instead of drawing the thoughts of God from them. When these obvious conditions are complied with, the interpreter may, on the ground of the perspicuity of Scripture, expect his diligent and devout study to result in the ascertainment of the meaning of the text, so that he can set forth the result not as that which might be, but as that which is the meaning of the text.

Faith implies assurance. What we do not know as the word and will of God we cannot with any propriety be said to believe. We believe the testimony of God. He gives this by His Word, and only thus. We cannot believe what the Word of God does not declare; we cannot believe a declaration which we do not understand. The clearness of the divine testimony given in the Holy Scriptures is the presupposition of faith, because it is the indispensable condition of having an intelligent object of faith. We cannot believe when there is nothing to be believed, and that is the case so long as the Word conveys no clear meaning. How can a soul be said to believe a divine declaration which conveys no certain meaning, and which therefore presents nothing to be believed. Faith is certain. The belief which has no certainty has no faith. It may be a surmise or an opinion, but it is not faith, because it has no rest on a divine assurance. If it did, what that assurance is must be known. Faith has the clear testimony of God, who cannot err, to rest upon, and therefore it is faith, not doubt.

The interpreter must find the meaning of the text, so that faith can have a sure ground in the knowledge of God's testimony. That such assurance is attainable is not only implied in the nature of faith, as it is also in the nature of revelation, but it is repeatedly taught in Holy Scripture. When the apostle says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," (2 Tim. 3, 16. 17.) he not only implies that the Scripture is clear, as under that condition alone it could accomplish the end indicated, but he plainly teaches that in the man of God it affects the end for which it was given.

There are some who receive the light into their hearts and have the assurance which the divine testimony is designed to give. This is in accord with our Lord's cheering promise in this regard: "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on Him, If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8, 31. 32. The Word is clear, and those who devoutly hear it and meditate upon it shall apprehend the truth which it clearly presents, and shall therefore not remain in darkness. Christian hearts are to be firmly established in the truth which God has spoken and which faith apprehends as His infallible testimony. That is to unite the people of God and guard them against false teachers and damnable heresies. God gave ministers to the Church with the commission to preach the Word, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the statue of the fulness of Christ; that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Eph. 4, 12–14. The Word of God and the work of the ministry do not attain their end as long as the truth is not known and not believed as divinely certain. The sure word of prophecy is to render us certain of the things which we believe, "whereunto ye do well that ye take heed as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts." 2 Pet. 1, 19. The Word is the only thing that can make us certain amid the uncertainties of life, and that can give us light in the darkness of earth. That is a safe and sure guide, which is followed with confidence because it is God's testimony known and believed as everlasting truth. He is a faithful witness of the things pertaining to our peace, and those who receive His testimony are left in no uncertainty. They know them and are assured of them through the Word whose entrance gives

light and renders the man of God sure that his faith apprehends the mind of the Spirit.

The objections made against the perspicuity of Scripture and the certainty of the interpretation made by diligent and humble believers, are usually raised in the interest of Romanism and Unionism.

Romanists are prompted to teach that the Bible is obscure in order to discourage its use among the laity and gain some plausible ground for their doctrine, that the pope in his alleged infallibility is the only trustworthy expounder of the Scriptures. And Unionists are moved to accept the same error in order to further their plans of uniting different parties notwithstanding their manifest lack of unity. If the former can persuade Christians that the Bible is darkness, not a light shining in a dark place, and that it can in itself reveal nothing, but gives light only when the Spirit shines upon it from the mind of the pope, who alone can declare its meaning, their object is attained; for then men will have acknowledged that they are groping in darkness notwithstanding the Scriptures given by inspiration of God, unto which He commands us to take heed as unto a light shining in a dark place, and that their only hope of deliverance from the blackness of ignorance and death is to throw themselves at the feet of the pope. If the Unionists can persuade Christians that the revelation given in Holy Scripture is not sufficiently clear to enable all to see the saving truth and to unite upon that basis, but that different doctrines must be admitted in the Church with equal rights, because in view of the obscurity of the language revealing the doctrine we can not tell which is right and which is wrong, their purpose is accomplished; for then it will seem but stubborn bigotry and uncharitableness to refuse holding Christian fellowship with others who, seeing that we can not know what is truth and which is right, are just as likely to have the true doctrine as we, while we of course are just as likely to have the false doctrine as they. Romanism and Unionism agree in the fundamental error that the Bible is

not clear, and the deplorable results of the error experience has shown.

But it is argued that, whatever may be our theories, the facts indicate a lack of clearness in Holy Scripture, for how else, it is asked in a tone of triumph, could we account for the different interpretations given and the different denominations of Christians, who all, notwithstanding that they hold conflicting creeds, profess to stand alone upon the Word of God? When the alternative is presented to impute the fault to God's revelation or man's perverseness, we cannot hesitate a moment in giving our decision. The Scriptures can accomplish their avowed purpose only if they are clear, and they themselves claim to show the way of God clearly and perfectly: if then men fall into vicious errors, notwithstanding their plain teaching, the reason for this must be sought in the same source which furnishes the reason for the fact that many are lost notwithstanding that the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation, has been preached to them. "If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." 2 Cor. 4, 3. 4.

This does not imply that all who err in any point or in any degree are necessarily lost. It does not even imply that all who make divisions on account of their errors are necessarily unbelievers. The Holy Spirit assures us that some who build upon the true foundation wood, hay and stubble instead of gold, silver and precious stones "shall be saved, yet so as by fire." 1 Cor. 3, 15. But the apostle does thus show the root of the evil to be in the benighted heart of man. The darkness is that of the soul, not of the Word; and if even in some that are believers there be errors remaining that lead to schisms, this is not owing to any defect of light in the Gospel, but to the sin which is still in them and which obscures the view. The promise is given that the sincere inquirer in the Scriptures shall know the truth, and the truth shall make him free.

The history of rationalistic exegesis illustrates the subject before us. Men gave way to the questionings of their own reason, as the Reformed churches in contradistinction to the Lutheran were inclined to do from the days of the Reformation, and efforts were made to bring the Word into harmony with the thoughts of men's hearts. It will hardly be claimed by any person that, e. g. the words, "This is my body," which our Lord uses in connection with that which He commands us to take and eat in the Lord's Supper, are not clear. The difficulty that men find lies not at all in understanding the Lord's simple words. But when they begin to question whether that can be true which the words clearly declare, and begin to doubt the possibility of that which the words are plainly enough seen to mean, difficulties come in troops. The problem then is to find an explanation which will do away with the clear meaning without renouncing the words. Of course in this process pronouncing the words obscure is the first and most essential step. That opens up the whole realm of thought and fancy to the expositor, and many are the conflicting results which have thus been reached. So men questioned the miracles of our Lord, the resurrection, the divinity of Christ, the Trinity of the Godhead, and many other doctrines plainly taught in Holy Scripture. They did not find it difficult to understand the grammatical meaning of the words. The difficulty was about accepting that which the words plainly say. Whether these things could be was the troublesome question. And doubting whether they could be of course led to doubting whether they were said. Hence some other meaning was sought for the clear words, which had to be pronounced obscure in order to justify any search for another meaning than that which shone from the words like rays from the sun. This led to the marvelous displays of exegetical gymnastics which were the admiration of the enlightened and the merriment of the world a century ago. Such acrobatic performances could not endure. As the exegesis became ridiculous in its straining to get rid of the sense, some began to abandon the effort to make the words say what they persistently refused

to say, and to reject the words themselves as spurious. That seemed an easier path to the same goal. Thus Criticism took the place of Exegesis, and words that said what did not suit the interpreter and whose meaning could not be explained away, must be rejected from the canon. But when this was done the meaning which strenuous efforts had been made to explain away was recognized as indisputably the meaning which the words convey. Nothing is plainer than that rationalistic interpreters found passages setting forth articles of faith obscure and doubtful only as long as they desired to retain the words without accepting their obvious sense. When they once became bolder and hesitated not to reject portions of Scripture whose teaching was objectionable to them, they no longer found the words obscure, but admitted them to be clear, and boldly pronounced that false which the words so clearly expressed and which the Lutheran Church accordingly so unswervingly confessed.

God gave us His Word in Holy Scripture that we might understand it. That Word is clear and accomplishes its gracious purpose. It does this not in any such absolute way as to render every hearer or reader cognizant of the saving truth, whether he gives attention or not, or whether he permits the light to shine into his soul or not. The Word brings light as it brings life, and both may be resisted, so that we remain in darkness and in death. Unquestionably the work of the Holy Spirit is necessary to enable us fully to understand the words conveying the truth unto salvation. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1. Cor. 2, 14. Men cannot see the plain meaning of the words setting forth spiritual things as long as they follow their own carnal surmises and judgments. They must be brought into sympathy with them in order to understand them, as even in earthly things we can have no deeper insight into the things that have not won our hearts. The Holy Spirit who gave the words and lives and breathes in them leads those who hear to the full understanding. "No prophecy

of the Scripture is of any private interpretation." 1. Pet. 1, 20. No one can fully apprehend the sense unless the Spirit lead him into the truth. But the Spirit speaks by the Word which is clear, and they who devoutly study the words shall in their light see the truth and be gladdened by its power.

First of all then let the interpreter approach the Bible with the assurance that God speaks by it, and that He speaks to the end that we may understand and be saved. Let him recognize it as a first principle of Hermeneutics, that the Holy Scriptures are clear, and that the interpreter's task is to set forth the truth which is found in the words, not to use the words as an occasion for promulgating an opinion that is foreign to their sense. L.

INFANT BAPTISM.

Translated from the German of K. Kuehn.

What all in the doctrine of our Church have we not, in the course of time, seen made to totter, and that not only by our opponents, but also by our friends in their efforts to present it anew? We have also had the gain, in consequence, that thereby efforts have been called forth to establish it anew. The disturbing shocks have also reached the doctrine of the Sacraments as taught by our Church. With reference to Infant Baptism the doctrine of our Church no longer stands secure. Although but few directly antagonize Infant Baptism, there are also but few who still stand firm in this, that children are baptized according to the faith which they themselves have; and in the case of many the sacramental conception has already yielded to that of a consecration. The best proof that there is here really a weak point where the doctrine of the Church is threatening to vanish, is found in the new church liturgies in their baptismal formulas, although in other points they set the seal

upon the victory of the doctrine of the Church in our time. Therefore let the effort be made here to apply to this weak point the revision which will render it secure and to enforce the grounds on which Infant Baptism is justified as the same sacrament which adults receive when they are baptized.

Baptism is an act of the Triune God by which He adopts lost man as His own and transfers him to His kingdom. But this is done only in Christ. Therefore Baptism bestows Christ upon the person baptized and incorporates him into Christ. But only he is received whose guilt is forgiven, and whoever is regenerated and renewed by the Holy Spirit, is in Christ. Therefore what is said in the Catechism is true: "Baptism works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation." It is furthermore true that Baptism is a washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. . . . . .

This is scriptural doctrine. The Lord says: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3, 5. By these words the entrance into the kingdom of God is directly connected with Baptism, just as regeneration by the Holy Spirit is placed in an indissoluble relation with Baptism. In harmony with this the Apostle Paul says: God "saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Titus 3, 5. Hereby he also connects salvation, or, what is the same thing, the kingdom of God and regeneration, with Baptism. And in order that, per chance, the washing of regeneration may not be referred to something else than Baptism, we need only to compare the other passages in which the Apostle treats of Baptism, and we will be convinced that he everywhere ascribes such power to Baptism. Thus he ascribes to Baptism the appropriation of the whole merit of Christ, when he says: Christ gave Himself for the Church, "that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." Eph. 5, 25 and 26. Furthermore he ascribes to Baptism the fact that we have

through it put on Christ, when he says: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3, 27. He ascribes regeneration to it, when he says: Ye are "buried with Him (Christ) in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God." Col. 2, 12. And in another passage: "We are buried with Him (Christ) by Baptism into death." Rom. 6, 4. . . . . Just as the Apostle Peter makes the ark of Noah a type of Baptism. 1 Pet, 3, 21. For he thereby says that by means of Baptism an escape from the deluge of a drowning world is possible; and as much is asserted by this one figure as is said by Luther in the words: "Baptism works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation."

Were we not permitted to have our children baptized, they would have no Christ and no regeneration. It is no remedy against this disconsolation that the opponents of Infant Baptism confine their opposition to quite small children who are unable to speak. For a very large number of children die at such an age. Moreover, it is a great self-deception, if they think that their opposition to Infant Baptism is confined to the small circle of those children who die in infancy; it covers the whole sphere of the world of children in general. For if Baptism absolutely presupposes foregoing faith and foregoing confession, there is nothing left but the Baptism of proselytes, and Infant Baptism is annulled. For then we must needs be at least as particular with the children before baptizing, as with the catechumens; nay, we would have to have indubitable signs of their conversion before we could baptize them, from which it follows as a matter of course that only in very rare cases could we make up our minds to baptize a person not yet of mature age. Therefore we can well say with Calvin: "If Infant Baptism is not right, then is the grace of God less extensive and smaller in the New covenant than in the Old;" for in the latter it was His will that the children also should be received into the covenant of God by means of circumcision, whilst in the New He would have denied the seal of the

covenant to every child. And yet it is clear from the whole manifestation of Christ and from all the proclamations of the New Testament, that God's grace is much fuller and more general in the New Covenant than in the Old. Therefore a comparison of Baptism with circumcision should of itself teach us that Infant Baptism is possible and necessary. Neither is it permissible to say that this parallelizing of Baptism and circumcision is a human invention; for the Apostle Paul took the lead in this matter by calling Baptism, without further ceremony, the circumcision of Christ. Col. 2, 11.

But also the whole analogy of faith must strengthen us in our belief. For nothing is more certain than that God offers His grace in Christ to all men without exception. It does not harmonize with this fact to say that He has absolutely made no way of access to His grace in the case of a part of mankind—the numerous part embracing the little ones. Therefore it is not claiming too much when we say, in accordance with the passages which teach that Christ died for the sins of the whole world, that the universality of the baptismal command also requires that children should be baptized.

But much more plainly and exactly even than by the analogy of faith or by the comparing of Baptism with circumcision, is Infant Baptism accorded its rights by a statement of the Lord Himself. The Lord shows in the well-known passage: "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God," Luke 16, 18, that He wants the children to be baptized. True, this statement primarily says merely that Christ receives children and gives them the kingdom of God. But if this is the case, then He also desires them to be baptized. For this same Christ has said: No one can enter into the kingdom of God, except him who is born again of water and of the Spirit; and the same Christ promises salvation to those who are baptized. It does not countervail this to say that Christ in this passage merely blessed the children and did not baptize them. It is enough that He here tells

His disciples that the kingdom of God belongs to the children, and, in another passage, that every one who wishes to enter into the kingdom of God must be baptized. In this way He has commanded Infant Baptism. Let no one, moreover, seek to make this statement nugatory by saying that the children spoken of in it were not such infants as we are in the habit of baptizing. They were certainly infants who are yet being nursed; for Luke 18, 15, they are called "young children" (βρεφη, nurselings), and it is said of them that they were brought (Greek *carried*) to Christ. Moreover, let no one make use of the rationalistic dodge, that the statement: "Of such is the kingdom of God," means no more than that such will be able at some future time to enter the kingdom, namely when they have grown up and been instructed. For if Christ had not wished to say more than this, the disciples would have done right in forbidding the children to come to Him; seeing that then their time had not yet come. Christ, too, would not have said anything having special reference to the children; for what He said would have been no more than what He could have said also in regard to every adult Jew and Gentile: namely, that they should be properly instructed, and that whoever among them would repent should come into the kingdom of God. But evidently Christ wishes to say something special about children, and to impress something special upon the minds of the disciples. Therefore the words: "Of such is the kingdom of God," must be taken in all the force and fullness of which they are capable; namely this: "Of such," that is, of children that come unto me, "is the kingdom of God;" that is to say, these I, Christ, receive and give them really and truly the kingdom of God.

But if Christ Himself wished the children to be baptized, and if the apostles baptized them, then an unimpeachable tradition must trace Infant Baptism back to the apostolic age. Such is the case. Origen says in reference to the sixth chapter of Romans: "Therefore the Church also received from the apostles the tradition that little children

are to be baptized. For those to whom the mysteries of God were entrusted, knew that in all who are born the filth of sin is present, which filth must be washed away by water and the Spirit." Cyprian, however, writes that at a synod the opinion, which some one wished to enforce, that children should not be baptized before the eighth day, was rejected. The synod, moreover, declared that children are to be baptized, and that without the necessity of being bound to any prescribed time, such as the eighth day. Augustine in his work: *De baptismo contra Donatist.*, says in reference to Infant Baptism: "What the entire Church holds and what has not been instituted by councils, we can rightly regard as coming from the apostles.

All that could yet be said is this, that, if Infant Baptism has come down to us from the apostles, it cannot but be surprising to us that there are no traces of it in the holy Scriptures. There are assuredly traces of it in the Bible; but they are, as a matter of course, regarded as of no avail by those who are prejudiced against Infant Baptism. The pentecostal sermon of Peter already shows that it was the intention of the apostles to baptize the children together with the others. For thus it reads: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Acts 2, 36. All the house of Israel is all the people of the Old Covenant, including the circumcised children. In accordance with this Peter also continues: "The promise is unto you, and to your children." We are furthermore told in Acts 16, 31, that Paul said to the jailor at Philippi: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house;" and thereupon it is said that the jailor "was baptized, he and all his, straightway." In a similar manner Paul relates: "I baptized also the household of Stephanas." 1 Cor. 1, 16. In both cases the children are included, unless, per chance, there were each time no children present. The same apostle gives the admonition: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord." Eph. 6, 1. This is written to

baptized children; for only baptized children are in the Lord. Just so St. John says: "I write unto you, fathers;" "I write unto you, young men;" "I write unto you, little children, because ye have known the Father." 1 John 2, 13. These again are baptized children; for to know the Father is, according to the apostle, the same as to have the Son, in accordance with his statement: "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." 1 John 2, 23.

But if we no longer doubt that Infant Baptism is right, then we must also not doubt that children, when they are baptized, have faith, even if it be but a beginning, a potency of faith. For in and through Baptism they are embraced by the love of Christ; the Father and the Son have entered into and taken up their abode in them; the Holy Spirit has begun the spiritual life in them. But all this is not to be thought of without faith, even if this faith is a hidden and unconscious one. Yes, upon him who is regenerated the entire saving faith, at least according to its foundation, is bestowed. The supernatural spiritual life does not differ from the natural spiritual life. Even to the smallest child reason must be ascribed, but we cannot tell how and we help ourselves with images, such as that of a germ or of a slumbering spark. Even so must be ascribed to the smallest regenerated child the Holy Spirit and His effect, namely faith, albeit as a germ or a slumbering spark.

Accordingly the words of Christ: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved," are not to be understood thus: he in whom faith precedes and Baptism follows, shall be saved; nor thus: he in whom Baptism precedes and faith follows, shall be saved; but thus: he who has both, the objective grace of God, Baptism, and its subjective reception, faith, no matter which of the two precedes the other, shall be saved. P.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VIII. JUNE, 1888. No. 3.

THE VII. ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

SECOND PAPER.

It is the manifest purport of the second paragraph to enunciate the fundamentals of churchly unity, and to draw a line between them and such things as are considered non-essential. To this end it is declared what is sufficient to the true unity of the Church, and then what is held to be not necessary to it. The paragraph thus plainly suggests its own partition or order of discussion. Accordingly, and stated briefly, its

II. PROPOSITION

treats a) of the essentials, and b) of the non-essentials to the unity of the Church.

Ad a). As regards the first point the Confession says: "And to the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments." To ascertain the real sense of these words, it is necessary to have a clear conception in particular of the unity which is here in question. It is the unity of the Church, but of the latter as it is viewed by the Confession: that is, chiefly—because it is such essentially—as a spiritual body; and then subordinately—because it is such

accidentally—as in somewhat a body politic also. The Church, as the Apology declares, is chiefly—*principaliter*, fürnehmlich—a society of faith and of the Holy Ghost in the hearts. From this it follows that also the unity of this "society" must be *principaliter*, fürnehmlich, a unity "of the faith and of the Holy Ghost in the hearts." Then, because the Church is in this world and is constrained on that account to adapt itself for the time being to the circumstances surrounding it, it is, moreover, a society of externals also—a fact expressly admitted by the Apology. Extendedly and in a remote degree, therefore, its unity is also one in things external—in so far, namely, as these latter may involve or affect "the faith and the Holy Ghost in the hearts." More particularly: whatever forms and opinions as touching things earthly or human may be in vogue within the Church, in no case dare they militate against "the faith and the Holy Ghost in the hearts" lest the unity be disturbed. This is the least of what can be required of them. The Article's conception of Church unity is thus to be comported throughout with its conception of the Church itself. As the latter is in substance a society in things spiritual and divine, so is its unity likewise a unity in the same things and in them all. What is essential to the one, is the same to the other, and the accidental there is the accidental here. The unity itself, however, which is in question, admits of a double aspect, and the Article so views it too; for it speaks of it both from the subjective and from the objective point of view. From the former it is the unity in the Christian faith and love; from the latter it is the unity in the truth and right set forth in the Word of God. The latter is the ideal, the former the real, and empirically the ideal is generally in advance of the real.

The unity at which the Article aims in the words, "to the true unity," is the subjective one, but conceived of in the light of the objective ideal unity. It is the unity of the Church, and of this in the genitive of possession and condition: a something, therefore, that has entered into and that pervades its entire state of being, and in which the Church lives as in an element of life all its own. It is that unity which the Scriptures describe when, for example, in Acts 4, 32., they say of the first-fruits to the Spirit: "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul." It is that identity of holy heart-life which is called "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace"—Eph. 4, 3—and for which the Savior pleads with the Father when He prays: "That they all may be one; even as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in them, that they also may be in us . . . . I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that Thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as Thou lovedst me." John 17, 21 and 23. It includes the Christian walk; for "If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John 1, 6–7. Accordingly, it is, in substance, a union of hearts, of the many hearts that are all joined alike to the one heart of Christ. The strands, so to speak, of the cord by which Christians are thus bound to one another and all to their common Lord, are the knowledge, the faith, the hope, the love, the joy, in short, all the graces of God; and hence is their unity one that engages all the powers of the soul.

By this last remark it is of course not to be said that the spiritual life in virtue of which Christian believers are

"of one heart and of one soul," is in all of them the same in degree; what is meant is, that, whatever be the strength of it or its weakness, the life in all who are thus united is the same in kind. A mere lack of fulness and firmness in the faith-life, although it deplorably and even dangerously limits the Church's unity, yet it is not thereby corrupted. It is only when such lack is the result of error, of infidelity, of vice, and the like, that the unity is disturbed; and then the disturbing factor is, properly speaking, not the lack of the true and the good but the error and evil that cause it and that have insinuated themselves into the heart in the place of Christian truth and virtue. In a word: the Church's unity depends not so much upon the completeness as upon the purity of the faith and love of its members. What is essential is the identity of the spiritual life, the identity of substance and not of measure. If it were otherwise, then were Christian unity a thing impossible in this life, not to say, in the life to come. On the other hand, that all incompleteness in the Faith, even when excusable, is in itself an evil and may readily lead to corruption and thus destroy the unity in the Faith, is something not to be overlooked in this connection.

Two corollaries of great practical value are involved in the statement maintained here. The one is, that no Christian is to be considered as excluded from the unity with Christ and His Church, simply on account of ignorance and weakness in matters of faith: the measure and strength of faith that suffice to make a man a Christian, the same suffice also to introduce him into and keep him in unity with Christ and Christians. The other inference is, that error in the faith and godlessness in the life, because they corrupt and viciate the Church's unity, can in no case be tolerated,

and wherever they become manifest, the person guilty of them must be taken into discipline and, should it become necessary, expelled from communion with the Church. "Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye" the Scriptures exhort, Rom. 14, 1; but nothing of the kind do they enjoin concerning such as are positively heretical and wicked. However of this more anon.

The modifier "true" is, without doubt, introduced by the Confession in opposition to every false notion of unity, but, as would appear from the context, especially against the opinions, first, of those who would connive at error and vice in the Christian life, and, secondly, of those who so extend their idea of unity as to have it embrace as necessary a uniformity in the polity and cultus of the Church. That the unity of the Church which the Article has in view is such as it has been described above, that is, a unity of the Christian faith and within the sphere of the latter, appears not only from the nature of the Church as it is conceived by the Article, but also from the means by which it says that such unity is to be brought about. The unity as one that is produced and preserved exclusively by the Gospel and Sacraments, is a unity also essentially only in the substance of the Gospel and Sacraments; and when, moreover, it insists on a "right" administration of the means of grace it does this in order to secure the "true" unity, that is, one from which is excluded all error in matters of the Faith.

Now since this unity, from the point of view taken of it thus far, is something inward and spiritual, it is, as much as is the faith of which it is the harmony, something which, as such, eludes the sense of man. Therefore it is an object of faith, but of a faith most certain, even as the unity is most real and one which manifests itself by its wholesome

and pleasant fruits wherever it has found entrance among men. Nevertheless, on account of its intangible nature, all the more important is it from its objective point of view; the one to which the Article calls attention more directly in the words that follow.

"To the true unity of the Church"—the unity subjective—"it is sufficient to agree concerning the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments;" that is, the consensus in the "right" administration of the means of grace, or the objective unity, is necessary and is sufficient to produce the true inward unity of the Church. The Christian faith and its fruits are the products of the divine Word; but on account of the absolute oneness of the Word as the producing cause, there must be and will be unity also in its products, that is, in the faith and fruits of faith engendered by the Word. In order, however, that the unity among those who receive the Word may be pure and holy and conform in every respect to the pure and holy source from which it is derived, the application of the Word must likewise be pure; hence the Confession insists that the administration of the means of grace take place "*recte*" or, as the German text has it, „in reinem Verſtand." The best of powers can be corrupted and the best of instruments be badly handled; in either case the product will be a more or less abortive one, and in nothing more than in things spiritual does this relation between cause, operation and effect work itself out with greater precision and certainty. Hence the importance to the Church of pure doctrine and practice.

That this its principle of unity then be recognized and acted on also, the Article advances to still another point by declaring unanimity on the part of Christians necessary in order that, by the pure Word, the Church's unity may be

secured. Evidently the adverbials „einträchtiglich und im reinen Verſtand" in the German, and the verb "*consentire*" in the Latin text, refer to the members of the Church, though no mention is made of them. To preserve and foster the unity of the faith to which they have already attained, and to bring others into this unity, the members themselves must have the right mind and the firm will that the means of grace be purely administered; the sound theory must needs be reduced to a no less sound practice by the intelligence and the resolute determination of all concerned.

The scripturalness of the position taken by the Confession on the subject in hand is apparent from many passages, and, indeed, from the whole tenor of the Bible's teaching. Not only do the Scriptures teach, in the main, that the entire Christian life is the product wholly and solely of the Word, they even at times single out and specify as a fruit of that Word the unity and fellowship of those whom it has regenerated unto the new life. "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." 1 John 1, 3. These words clearly show that Christian unity is an object of, and an object attainable by the preaching of the Gospel. The same is true of Baptism; "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and were all made to drink of one Spirit." 1 Cor. 12, 13. The Supper, moreover, is instituted to purify, if need be, and strengthen the bond. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread." 1 Cor. 10, 16–17.

The importance the Scriptures attach to this unity is by them considered to be of such magnitude that they declare it to be an end of all offices to the Church. "And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God," etc. Eph. 4, 11–14.

One God and one Word of God; one faith and one spirit by this Word; in that faith and spirit, unity and union; and in these, and in these alone, fellowship and co-operation—such, in brief outline, is the teaching of the seventh Article and of Holy Writ. Simple and incontrovertibly true as it is and in its main features is acknowledged to be by Protestant Christians generally, yet is there hardly any principle which in practice were met by greater difficulties than is this one. Nothing, especially at the present time, is treated with such utter disregard by people professing to be Christians, as is God's own way to unity. Finding it too narrow and too arduous for themselves and others to reach the coveted goal, they have taken it on themselves to widen and smooth the way to unity until of both the unity acceptable to God and the way he has appointed to it, very little remains.

The Scriptures, as does the Confession, require the means of grace to be administered in their truth and purity, but by many the divine will is not heeded; the teaching of error is forbidden, but errors are both taught and believed within the Church. Whatever the cause or the causes at the bottom of it, the evil is a most real one and quite extensive. Such being the case, the Word of God must necessarily fail, as it does fail, to produce the one pure faith everywhere;

and thus are true unity and fellowship of all with all believers rendered impossible. It is a stubborn fact but a fact nevertheless that, as regards the problem of unity, it is utterly impossible to reach the end without the proper means and by ways other than the correct one. Those, therefore, whose love for union seems to run away with their love for truth and who appear to dread divisions more than they do the displeasure of God, will find to their cost that every proposal looking to a union of the churches by a way different from the one ordained of God, will of a certainty prove itself entirely futile, and in all probability only increase the the evil of heresy and schism. The division of the Church is a deplorable evil; the proposition, however, for the sake of good feeling and kindly fellowship to ignore the differences and to bear with the perversity at the root of the evil, while it can do nothing toward mending it, is in fact a disgraceful submission to the existing state of affairs and by its mum-mum policy plants the seal of approval upon it. Every such overture to a persistent rejection of God's truth is on its own face a flagitious overturn of the Scripture's injunction: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." Rom. 12, 21.

What is necessary to the true unity of the Christian Church, the seventh Article sets forth very plainly and precisely when it declares that the Gospel in its pure sense be proclaimed, and that the Sacraments be dispensed in accord with God's Word. The declaration, it will be observed, is wholly positive; it does not say, in so many words, what is to be thought of those Christians and bodies of Christians who indeed have the Gospel but not in purity, nor what is to be done with them. But then its answers to such questions may easily be inferred from what is said. It is a mistake, for example, to impute to the Article and to

those who rigidly walk by the rule it lays down, that they thereby unchurch every Christian and body of Christians among whom the Gospel and Sacraments are not in pure use. The existence of erring churches is tacitly recognized, and whilst the Article acknowledges them to be churches, or if not as Christian churches yet as embracing Christians, it is careful to imply that such churches are not what they ought to be. The first paragraph states distinctly that the Christian Church is the assembly of those believers among whom the Gospel is purely preached, etc.; at the same time, aware of the fact that for many centuries the churches as they really were constituted had not the pure Word of God, it notwithstanding that fact maintains the unbroken continuity of the Church of Christ throughout all time. It is thus tacitly admitted that the Church at times and in places may fall into error, and yet be the Church of Christ in spite of such errors. In view of the Gospel truth which suffices to make the people of certain denominations Christians, such denominations are still to be considered as being Christian churches; in view of their rejection of and antagonism to other Gospel truths, however, they are sects and are to be treated accordingly; the mediating and comprehensive term by which they are properly denominated is, "erring Christian churches." Comp. *Philippi, Glaubenslehre* Vol. 5 P. 3. p. 18.

It must be admitted, however, that the Article is at times made use of in such an inconsiderate way as may readily bring it into disrepute among those not acquainted with its true import. Its own words, properly understood, furnish no grounds on which any one could reasonably charge upon it an undue severity or unrighteousness of judgment. The fact is, it does not presume to pronounce on the relation to their God of any class of Christians, its sole purpose being

to stand up for the truth of God and for the sovereignty of that truth in all the affairs of the Church; and this it does in an entirely objective way of presentation.

If now an extremist may be found occasionally among the subscribers to the Confession on this point, its most numerous and most doubtful friends are the liberal minded. The spirit of the age is decidedly latitudinarian, and the Lutheran Church has not everywhere succeeded to protect herself against its influence. The consequence is that the Confession is interpreted to suit the times; and under the stress of the prevailing spirit violence is done to no Article more than to the seventh. Opposed as it is to the liberal and unionistic tide that has set in, this is what might have been expected; though that men professing to be Lutherans should join in the attack, makes the grievance all the greater.

The assurance is given by the latter that they subscribe to the Augsburg Confession, the seventh Article included, in good faith. They do so with such frequency and fervor as to make their word suspicious; be this as it may, there is no reason to doubt their honesty; what is in question, is, the interpretation they put on the Article and the way they apply it; and here they are most assuredly in the wrong. They claim, in the first place, that the Gospel in the sense of the Confession does not mean all the teachings of the divine Word; and then, in the second place, that all fellowship with non-Lutherans is not proscribed by it. Both points require separate consideration.

Under the first point the opinion is advanced that the Gospel preaching which is declared sufficient to the true unity of the Church is intended to embrace only what are called fundamentals; and a corresponding limitation is put on the administration of the Sacraments, as also of necessity

upon the unity of the Church to be achieved through them and the Gospel. By thus raising the question of fundamental and non-fundamental doctrine, a way is devised by which the Confession may be so interpreted as to make it acceptable to all who can yet be looked upon as belonging to the better class of Protestant Christians—always provided that the latter are willing to have their own distinctive doctrines treated as non-essential ones. That by such a disreputable policy—mildly designated—not the least advance can be made toward a genuine unity in the faith, must be apparent, one should think, to everybody; and yet there are people whose eyes and consciences have become so dull under the unionistic influence of the times, that they consider indifference to God's truth and the suppression at will of one's most holy convictions to be both a lawful and efficient way to bring about a unity of the sadly divided Church. A pretty sort of unity, forsooth, were that to effect which everybody is held to believe or not to believe, teach or not to teach, do or not to, in order that he hurt no one and please every other body. That would certainly be a unity made to order and one in which, on principle and in practice, all differences in the faith are ignored, no matter how precious might be the truths and how weighty the interests at stake. Really, people come to such a pass as this, are fanatics; and at heart they can care no more for a true and thorough unity of the Church than they do for the truth of God, its legitimate foundation: what they want is, union and fellowship; and this, if it can be, with the truth in it; if not, then without it—union "with a vengeance."

Sad to say, there are people professing to be Lutherans who have fallen in with this bad way. To vindicate their Lutheranism and unionism both, they have especially the

seventh Article to deal with; and thence, as stated above, the subterfuge of doctrines fundamental and non-fundamental. But this shift can not serve them here; neither the plain words of the Article and of Scripture nor the facts in the case allow it. The division of doctrines into fundamental and non-fundamental ones, is quite proper and of use in its place; out of place and misapplied, as it is by unionists, it becomes positively injurious. When, for example, the question is asked, How many truths of God's Word must a person know and believe in order to be saved, and which are they? the answer is, Very few, and these are the fundamental doctrines, and his ignorance of the other, the non-fundamental ones, will not condemn him. But what if the question be put: How many of these latter ones may he know and deny? what then were the answer? Not one! No, not one; for who should give to man the right at any time and for any purpose to deny what he holds to be a truth of God, and were it the least one of His revelation? But Lutheran Christians know and by the operation of God believe the distinctive doctrines of their Church to be the God-given truth: how then can they surrender or by suppression deny any part of it; and how can they be asked to do so? Every such presumption bears on its own face the downright wickedness of what it demands and in a manner so glaring that it is hard to believe Christians guilty of putting it to their fellow Christians. Nevertheless, that this very thing is done, is the bitter truth; and what is worse, those who do not yield are for their fidelity reviled by their tempters as sticklers, presumptuous, hard of heart, bigoted, and the like. Howbeit, the point to be noticed here is, that the possibility of salvation by a few truths of God's Word—the essential ones—does not imply the priv-

ilege of indifference to and of an arbitrary denial of the other truths of that Word. A conscious denial of divine truth, be it which it may, is a damning sin; and they who persist in it shall surely perish. To eat of the forbidden fruit: what a small offense it appears to have been, and yet the sin, how heinous, the consequences how disastrous! But what was it in its naked reality? Man's knowing objection to and revolt against the sovereign will of God his Creator. Hence the sentence just: Thou shalt surely die!

Is not the supremacy and majesty of God's will and way set at naught by every sin, big or little, and whether it consist in the rejection of His truth or in the disobedience to His command? And is the righteous judgment of God less severe now than it was in Adam's day? No, if "cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of the law to do them," should this be less true concerning the words of the Gospel? As old as is the curse held out over the Law is this other over the Promise: "I will raise them up a Prophet, like unto thee, and I will put my words in His mouth; and He shall speak unto them all that I command Him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which He shall speak in my name, *I will require it of him.*" Deut. 18, 18. Comp. John 12, 48. and similar passages.

But there is another phase in which the division of doctrine deserves to be looked at, to-wit, in that of the worth of doctrine to the Church. What is essential to the bare saving of a soul, is one question; what is essential to the Church is another. If the single and supreme object of the Church's existence were the narrow escape from hell by its members, then might the questions be considered identical—though, as has been shown, with no results agreeable to un-

ionists. The object of the Church is the salvation to the glory of God of all mankind, and that salvation in the fullest sense of the term, hence including the edification of souls unto a perfect manhood in Christ Jesus. As the means to that end the entire Word is given her, and the entire Word is necessary. If then the question be put: What is necssary to the Church—and therefore to the churches also—in order that souls be not merely rescued from hell but be perfected in the new life and for God's glory? the answer must be: To that, the entire Word is necessary. Not a single truth of it can be spared; and least of all can the Church at any time and for any purpose whatsoever knowingly surrender a jot or tittle of what is entrusted to her by her Lord and Master. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 5, 16–17. (Comp. the charge following in chap. 4, 1–5). "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;* and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28, 19–20. "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Matt. 4, 4.

That every truth of the Word—be it which it may—is God's truth, is profitable, is to be received, adhered to and put to use: all this ought to be a self-evident matter among Christians, even if the Scriptures were not so clear, as they are, in setting it forth. Within the sphere of the things of God there can be no compromise; men have no liberty and no privilege here except the liberty and privilege of use.

God's will is supreme, and, as seen, His will toward men is that all His Word, being holy and precious, be so esteemed also and used accordingly. Charity must admit that they know not what they do when Christian people nowadays say to one another: "For the sake of peace, let us yield our differences;" but in reality such talk is shockingly wicked. They boldly propose to surrender what they hold to be God's truth, or, as the case may be, God's command; and thus do they profane the High and Holy One, set at naught His sovereignty, and put themselves in a way that leads to destruction. And for what? For the forbidden pleasure and for the doubtful profit of a sham peace!

Neither is there any escape from this conclusion and from the condemnation it carries with it, unless such people admit that the differences between them involve no truth and no command of God, but human opinions and human practices only. If so, then by all means let them drop their differences, but at the same time repent of the grievous sin whereby they have troubled the Church and brought, God knows, how much woe on her. As for Lutherans, they have no quarrel with anybody for opinion's sake: their contention is for what they believe to be, and is, the truth and the will of God. Such being the case, they can yield nothing, no, not a single point. What they have they hold in trust for God, and they were faithless stewards if they abandoned the property of their Lord—faithless to their Master, and faithless to themselves because of the inestimable benefits they derive from the things they are asked to give up. "For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." 2 Cor. 13, 8. Against the truth, nothing; for the truth, everything! that is the rule whereby they would walk, God helping them. And this they would do for the

sake also of their opponents, each one saying to all even while these oppose him: "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" Gal. 4, 16.

The reason then why the Lutheran Church can have no fellowship with other churches is simply this, that within the sphere of divine truth and order there is between them no unity which is the heart and life of fellowship. The actual state of things, sinful and painful as it is, cannot be denied, and dare not be because the things of God are at stake. The only honest and manly way in this warfare for the truth is that the contestants acknowledge the situation and face the difficulties; and then not rest content with it but endeavor to get out of it by God's own way and with the truth as the victor. What that way is, the Confession clearly states; and if the achievement of the unity of all Christians in the true faith and by the pure truth of that faith must appear a hopeless task—because even Christians at times will, in spite of their better selves, love darkness better than light—let it be borne in mind that, whether much or little be accomplished, the way thus pointed out is God's own. What shall be attained by it is His care; it is the Christian's business to follow as his Master directs.

Another point: if the Lutheran Church appear to some to be too exclusive and as averse to a union with other churches, the apparent excess of rigidity must be ascribed to her deep conviction that she is in possession of the truth, and then to the fact that she sees this truth rejected and assailed by the churches about her. The separate existence of these churches is to her a plain declaration of war against what she believes to be the God-given truth. And in this she is not mistaken. The truths which other churches hold in common with her can not be and are not the ground of

their separate organization; their separate existence is due to and has for its express purpose the defence and dissemination of their own particular views and observances; and hence, what they aim at is the overthrow and displacement in other churches of everything antagonistic to those tenets and customs which to establish they have set up for themselves. To treat such churches as good friends and to receive with open arms a people organized and busily employed to despoil her of treasures God has put in her custody —to do that, verily, the Lutheran Church would have to be smitten with blindness if she were thus to expose herself to the foe in disguise. On the other hand she is not forgetful of her mission with regard to the truth committed to her, nor of the duty to those who go without it. Accordingly she holds herself ever ready in the spirit of love to reason with the erring, and to fight with them that oppose her the good fight of faith; even as the Scriptures exhort: In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will. 2 Tim. 2, 25-26. And here be it remarked by way of parenthesis: what hinders her from doing more of this work of correction is, among other things the prejudice of ignorance she encounters among her opponents. The latter count their doctors of divinity by the thousand; but of the history of dogmas and of comparative theology and of other such useful things the great mass of these doctors would seem to know very little. But too often do they depend upon Worcester and Webster for their information concerning points of theology that are quite vital.

It may seem presumptuous on her part to say so, but

the ultimatum of the Lutheran Church to all who seek a union with her or with whom she would enter into union, is: You must come to us, our faith must become yours, your faith cannot become ours. Other terms she cannot offer as long as she is convinced that she possesses in their purity the means of grace, administers them rightly and desires no other union than that which is based on the unity in the true faith as this is set forth in her Confessions.

There are unionistic Lutherans who, in the main, acknowledge the validity of this position but who, failing to see the full force of it, hold that when a union of churches cannot be arrived at, occasional church fellowship may take its place. It is boldly asserted that when a formal union is by the voice of Scripture and the interests of particular churches forbidden, the practice of Altar and Pulpit fellowship may not be disallowed, yea, that under circumstances it may become a duty as well as a privilege. In one of the latest deliverances on this subject it is argued, in substance, that the seventh Article is not only far from proscribing the fellowship of Lutherans with people of other Christian denominations, but that it logically implies the obligation of doing that very thing.* The line of argument employed to establish this astounding proposition is in the main, and briefly stated, as follows:—In the first place, attention is called to the distinction between the essentials of the Gospel and its non-essentials; where the line is to be drawn is not stated, but that the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church are put in a class with the latter is apparent from

*So in an article by Dr. Valentine on "The Fundamental Principles of the General Council." Luth. Quart., Oct. 1887.—For a reply to this ingenious piece of work and its many captious statements, the present writer has thus far looked in vain.

the entire drift of the reasoning employed. In the second place it is set forth that in virtue of the essentials and within their sphere there is the generic unity of the Church, and that in this unity all Christians and Christian churches are embraced. Similarly, and corresponding to the non-essentials, there is moreover the specific, that is, the unity in the distinctive denominational faith. In the third place, it is asserted that the generic unity is entitled to manifestation, and that in order to it Christians (of every description, it would seem,) should at times enter into fellowship thereby to show forth the oneness of the Church universal; and this duty the specific unity, which also has its rights, cannot annul, since it stands in relation to the former as the minor to the major unity. And, finally, the seventh Article is dragged in to do unwilling service by the assumption that the Church and the unity had in view by it is the Church catholic and the unity œcumenical; moreover, that by the pure preaching of the Gospel which is declared sufficient to the unity of the Church the essential doctrines are meant. Thus is the Augsburg Confession made so say that Lutherans may practice Pulpit and Altar fellowship with people of every name, just so these be Christians. What bunglers the authors of that document must have been, seeing how awkwardly they have expressed themselves; and how faithless in that they did not practice what they taught; then, that the whole Lutheran Church is found in the same condemnation, who can bear the thought of it!

To expose the utter fallacy of the views advanced, and the violence that is done to the Confession, is not in place here; besides, to do so the article in question would have to be reproduced at greater length in order to do justice to it and to the subject in the way this is handled; a few obser-

vations must suffice. In the first place, the distinction between a generic and a specific unity with regard to the Church has been made and it has its use; but this is quite limited. If for example it be given to determine whether or not a church is entitled to a name, the meaning of which is historically fixed, it must be ascertained whether or not said church is in the unity that specifies the particular church which is historically the lawful bearer of that name.* So, again, the unity of the Lutheran Church within the sphere of her distinctive doctrines may be called her specific unity in reference to all those churches who reject those doctrines; but it is not right and proper to call this part of her unity in the faith her specific unity with reference to the unity of the Church universal. The unity of the latter includes the former unity as a constituent and integral part and is one with it. Since the faith which the Lutheran Church adheres to in common with all Christians and the faith she has in distinction from them is one faith, the faith of the Church, so is her unity but one, the unity of the Church. This, every one who can truly call himself a Lutheran, must admit and uphold. Doing this, the so-called specific unity of every other church is to him, not a specific church unity but, properly speaking, the unity of a sect; that is, a unity in a faith that is opposed to the Word of God; and hence, harsh as it may sound, a unity of the devil. Let it be freely admitted that the great mass of sectarian people are Christians, that they have enough of the truth to make them such, that they love, nobly defend and zealously spread that truth—nevertheless the stubborn fact

* This, the writer takes it, is also the purpose for which the distinction is introduced in the second and third of "The Fundamental Principles" alluded to.

remains that they grievously err in many things contrary to the Word of God, that they are strongly attached to their errors, that they are separately organized for the very purpose of introducing them wherever they can, and thus array themselves in bitter opposition to the truth. And with such people Lutherans are asked to fellowship; are told that it is their duty, and that their chief Confession is of the same opinion. Surely, such blindness and treachery and such indifference to the truth and will of God, one would not expect to meet within one's own household.

As it is not true "that the Christian Church is marked both by generic unity and by specific unities—for what part has the Christian Church in the wicked unities marking the several sects?—no more is it "unquestionably true that the differences between the specific Creeds of the parts"—i. e. of denominations—"do not amount to a nullification of the really Christian and church character of those parts." It is true, on account of the absolute unity of divine truth and its supreme power, that where this is allowed to have sway and work itself out, it will banish everything contrary to it; but it is no less true that while the words of truth act like a sweet leaven, the words of error "will eat as doth a canker" till the soul is destroyed. If it cannot be said that entire churches have been wholly deprived of their Christian character, or of what they had of it, who but God can tell the countless thousands of individual souls that have perished by the heresies of sectarianism? And then, whence are the Christless churches? Are they not the legitimate product of indifference and opposition to "the minor doctrines" of God's Word? History answers that in no case are they the direct plants of the devil, but that they are the mongrel offspring of error in the lap of truth.

To justify their illicit intercourse with errorists, great stress is laid by unionists on the œcumenical symbols to which all Christians subscribe. These symbols having greater authority than those received only by particular churches, this principle, it is asserted, "forbids us to treat the specific witness as everything and the genuine as nothing, or to intensify the specific into a repudiation of the œcumenical unity or fellowship." Nor is this done: the subscription in good faith to those symbols by all Christians does establish a bond between them, and this bond finds expression in the very act of subscription as it does, moreover, in the more private recognition of all by all as Christians. But to recognize errorists as still Christians, their errors notwithstanding, is one thing; to admit them into churchly fellowship is quite another thing. As the recognition of a person as being still a Christian does not of necessity involve an approval of his errors and vices, no more does a refusal of fellowship with him on account of these amount to a repudiation of him as being no longer a Christian. What is to be the attitude of Christians to such Christians as persistently reject portions of revealed truth and who to prosecute the infamous work of disseminating error have entered into formal organization among themselves—that the Word of God must decide. Lacking what is necessary and holding what is opposed to and destructive of the true unity of the Christian Church, they are, by the Confession, placed beyond the bounds of churchly fellowship. And with good reason; for churchly fellowship is but the expression of churchly unity, and what is a disturbing element to the latter can certainly not be entitled to a place in the former.

Moreover, this subscription to the faith universal re-

quires a closer scrutiny than is generally given it by those who appeal to it so much. It is true, in their historic sense the three symbols of the early Church say a great deal; they are a fine summation of saving truth, but what are they and do they say as they are interpreted by those who profess to receive them?—that is the question here. In view of the oneness of divine truth, is it not a thing surpassingly strange that every ism in Christendom thinks itself in accord with those old symbols, if not as being itself a logical deduction from what they say? Pantheism and Calvinism, Rationalism and Romanism, heresy old and heresy new—all take shelter under the venerable standard of ancient Christendom. Thus, for example, does the New Theology which denies the atonement altogether find no greater difficulty in subscribing to the old Faith, than does predestinarianism which confines the atonement to the elect. With such facts before them, men should be careful in their estimate of subscription to the symbols; unconscionable as people have become in acts so sacred, this one in particular may amount to very little. But even when the doctrinal error is not so glaring as it is in some instances, the fact remains that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." The sweeping statement that minor differences cannot viciate the greater, because it is the fundamental unity, is therefore unscriptural. And it is illogical and contrary to history: the former, because all God's truth is one; the latter, because error in non-fundamentals has repeatedly led to errors in fundamentals and thus sent countless souls to perdition.

The chief question in all this controversy, as far as Lutherans are concerned in it, is, whether the position they take with regard to it is the Scriptural as well as the Confessional one, or rather, whether the declaration of the Con-

fession with the practice of non-fellowship with errorists which that declaration involves, are in accord with the rule of Scripture. And this they certainly are. To put over against the many exhortations to fidelity to the truth and the injunctions that fellowship with such as corrupt the Word be avoided, where have the unionists a single permit of indifference to the truth and of receiving such as oppose it? In such a predicament, is it a wonder that the hearts of unionists—inclined as they are to flirt in forbidden quarters—smart under the application of the divine rule, and that they dread the rule as wayward children are wont to dread the rod? "One gets weary of seeing this"—Gal. 1, 6–9—"and parallel texts made to do forced service in a relation in which they have no applicability." But the proof, good man, the proof that the chastisement has fallen on the innocent? Unless the proof be brought to the contrary "the Gospel of Christ" will stand for the truth as it is in Jesus, not for this one or that one of it, but for the whole. The Gospel certainly means the Gospel and not a part of the Gospel. "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature"—does that mean, the main facts and the leading truths, or all the facts and the whole truth? The answer, if there should be any doubt about the matter, is given elsewhere, and reads: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

Wherefore, whether unionists will hear or forbear, hear it they must to the end of their days: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach

any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Gal. 1, 6–9. From all accounts, the heretics here condemned were Judaizing Christians who asserted the necessity of circumcision to salvation. Comp. Acts 15, 1; Gal. 5, 1–12 and 6, 12. Now in what respect were these worse than the Baptists of to-day who insist on the form of immersion, or than those work-righteous Christians who assail the doctrine of imputed righteousness? And yet is fellowship had again and again with people of this sort. Are not these false prophets, and does not the Lord exhort His own to beware of them? "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences—occasions of stumbling, R. V.—contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." Rom. 16, 17–18. Equally explicit is the charge as touching the life. "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat." 1 Cor. 5, 5. "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us." 2 Thess. 3, 6. See also 1 Tim. c. 6. With this compare the positive injunctions to fidelity in doctrine and life as found in such passages as Matt. 5, 13–16 and Mark 9, 50; John 8, 31 and 1 Cor. 1, 10; Eph. 4, 1–14; 1 Tim. 4, 16; 2 Tim. 1, 13; 3, 14–17; 4, 1–5; Tit. 1, 9–11 and 2, 7. The

modus procedendi to be followed with such as sin against the Word of God is laid down, for all cases, in Matt. 18, 15–20 and, for that of persistent errorists in particular, in Titus 3, 10: "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject: knowing that he that is such is subverted (perverted), and sinneth, being condemned of himself." Concerning the character of the αἱρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος there is, among commentators of note, hardly any disagreement. In general, he is a teacher of false doctrines; more particularly, one who, as the text says, is perverted, and who by false teaching is apt to cause divisions in the Church; hence, a false teacher and schismatic. Whether this latter designation is wholly justified by the term αἱρετικός itself, is somewhat doubtful, the use in 1 Cor. 11, 19. Gal. 5, 20 and 2 Peter 2, 1 of αἱρέσεις notwithstanding, since this can in all cases be rendered "false doctrine;" however, all false doctrine is schismatic in its tendency.

According to the plain rule of Scripture, therefore, the attitude Christians are to assume toward such people as believe and teach what is contrary to the Word of God, is that they in love reason with them and, should this prove fruitless, to avoid them. To fellowship them in a religious way is positively forbidden. And the fact that at the present time such people have formally combined in part for the express purpose of dislodging the truth thereby to make room for their own fallacious notions, gives an additional emphasis to the rule and to the importance of its faithful observance. And this is what the principle laid down in the seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, if it be rightly understood and correctly applied, must lead every Lutheran Christian to do. As the true unity of the Christian Church is a unity in the truth and by the truth—the truth must be

upheld, error must be kept down, and this by a battle in which the flag of truce is an unknown thing.

There was a time when this position was considered the correct one by all, at least among Lutherans; but that day is past. How would-be Lutherans nowadays get around the plain declarations of the Church's Confession on the subject of union and how they explain away the no less plain injunctions of Scripture in the matter—that is no secret at all. As faithful pupils of their sectarian masters they have learned to look upon "specific doctrines," "specific practices," "specific polities" and whatever else may belong to "the specific unities" of the Church (?), as of not much account—as things not worth the quarrel had about them in the days of the quarrelsome past. And then, in the business of transferring from the "essential" to the "non-essential" and from the "generic" to the "specific" they have made such a promising beginning, that there is no telling what all may yet be accomplished by them in that line. Such being the position taken in the premises, there can be no trouble about putting in harmony with the Confessions and with Scriptures the rankest unionism. Thus, for example: warned by the Scriptures to beware of such as preach "another gospel," it is only necessary to reduce the Gospel of Christ to a few central truths, and the thing is done—the man with "another gospel," found to teach nothing contrary to the few central truths, comes within the sphere of "allowable dissent," is no dangerous fellow at all, rather is he a good Christian brother, should be fellowshiped, in his case the warning of Scripture cannot apply; etc. So too may a man empty the means of grace of all their substance and power, if at the same time he make profession of Christ as in some way the Son of God and the

Savior of men—then is he no heretic such as is to be rejected. Now it is not meant to be affirmed here that there is any considerable number of "Lutherans" who actually go to this length; but the tide that has set in is leading strongly in that direction, and not a few are swept along by it, and unless the good Lord stays them on their downward course, it may be easily predicted where they will land.

Finally, the charge that by the fidelity to the whole truth of God's Word and the Faith laid down in her Confessions, and which fidelity she manifests in her refusal to fellowship sectarians, the Lutheran Church asserts for herself "the attitude and character of a schism" is a piece of blindness bordering on impudence. If separation be schism, then, yes. But since when is the separation for faith's sake from people who persist in teaching and acting contrary to God's Word called schism? No, this charge can only be brought against the Lutheran Church, if the cause of her separation from others were other than her fidelity to the Word and will of her Lord. If her distinctive doctrines are not of God, then of course might such a charge be preferred against her with a show of right, at least. But then if "Lutherans" who prefer the charge put such an estimate upon the distinctive doctrines of "their" Church, then are they the schismatics, for then do they separate themselves from other Christians for no sufficient cause—and that is schism.

C. H. L. S.

RECENT RESEARCH IN BIBLE LANDS.

The Bible is, from its human side, emphatically an Oriental book. There is not in existence another literary work or collection of literary productions which reflects in almost every line so completely as do the sacred Scriptures

the historic surroundings of time and place under the influence of which they were written. While the substance of Scriptures, the eternal verities of revealed truth, are in the character and essence and origin independent of and above the historical atmosphere associated with their transmission to man, yet the forms in which a large portion of this revelation is given strongly reflects the local, national and historical surroundings. It is for this reason that a thorough knowledge of the geography, topography and history of Palestine, of the peculiarities of oriental thought and expression of thought, particularly of the idiosyncracies of the Semitic type of mind as represented by the Hebrew member of that family of peoples, as indeed of the whole historical background of Scriptures in the widest sense of the term, that this knowledge helps materially to understand and appreciate in their whole length, breadth and depth the words of revealed truth. Had one of the Japhetic or Aryan nations, say the Greeks or the Romans, been chosen of God as the vehicles for His revelations to mankind, then beyond all doubt the human caskets in which the jewels of divine truth are deposited would have been different. The philosophic tendencies of the Greek mind and the legal tendencies of the Latin would, without interfering with the divine character of this truth, have been reflected in the manner in which it would have been expressed. Just as in the several books of the Scriptures as they now are the individual traits of the different authors can be traced in their writings, thus, too, the whole Scriptures directly and indirectly tell the time and place of their origin. The imagery of the Psalms and other poetical books of the Old Testament, the narrative method of the historical books, the many-shaped forms which the visions and warnings of the prophets assume, the

mould into which the gospel records are cast, are all charged with allusions and references, more or less distinct, to the time and place of their composition. Even for the understanding of so abstract a subject as St. Paul's doctrinal and polemical discussion, we can, as far as their manner and method is concerned, study to greater advantage the dialectics of the Jewish rabbinical schools at Jerusalem than the philosophy of Plato or the rhetoric and syllogisms of Aristotle. Renan, the gifted but godless French Hebraist, significantly calls the Holy Land "the fifth gospel," and in a certain sense he is right. How much a thorough knowledge of the historical background of Scriptures can aid in understanding them is nowhere better shown than in Thomson's "The Land and the Book," which is the classical work on Palestine as a commentary on the Bible, and is the very best book for pastors to have on this subject. In the first of the three volumes of which this work consists, the author brings the light of Palestine facts to bear upon the exegesis of the first Psalm, and it is simply wonderful what new life and reality are thereby instilled into every fiber of that grand ode.

In this way it is the very opposite of idle curiosity, or at best merely an historical interest that has prompted learned societies and individual scholars to spend so much time and money on the investigation of Bible lands and Bible times. Through all this work Biblical science in the widest sense of the word has been the gainer; and if every jot and tittle of Scriptures is a revelation, then too any labor spent upon the full elucidation of even the minutest detail of these records is a profitable investment. If anywhere, accuracy and thoroughness are the part of wisdom here.

And just within the past few decades more and better

work has been done in this department than it fell to the fortune of the eighteen Christian centuries preceding this to do. The Bible lands have been called upon and are yet being called upon to tell their story for the benefit of the Bible student, and it is an interesting and instructive story they have to tell. For Palestine alone, learned societies have been established in England and Germany. Notably the former has accumulated an immense mass of material, having surveyed almost every inch of ground west of the Jordan from Dan to Beersheba, while the German Society, organized only ten years ago and not blessed with an overabundance of means, has done excellent work in the scientific examination of this material and has also sent at least one expedition of exploration to the Holy Land. The English Palestine Expedition Fund has immense resources at its command, and the latest and best materials gained appear in its "Quarterly Statements," while the most critical discussions appear in the *Zeitschrift* of the German Society. The American Oriental Society has about fifteen years ago sent out an exploration expedition to the country east of the Jordan, which brought back only partial but still the most reliable information hitherto known of that historic region. The United States expedition, under Captain Lynch, has furnished the best surveys and measurements of the Dead Sea hitherto known. Other societies and expeditions have done similar work, only in a more limited degree. The zeal of individual scholars has also done much for this field. Especially is this true of the great American scholar, Professor Robinson, of New York, whose "Biblical Researches" were really the first critical explanation of Palestine in the interests of Bible interpretations. He has had a number of followers, but none that excelled

him, and his work is to the present day yet a great storehouse for the Palestine student. Among his successors probably none has achieved more valuable results than Silas Merrill, late United States Consul in Jerusalem, whose studies of the birds of Palestine are exceedingly valuable, and whose work in investigating the recently discovered Old Second Wall of Jerusalem and of the discussion of the site of Calvary, based upon this discovery, has secured the recognition of European scholars as well as American.

It would however be a mistake to think that the good results of Palestine studies are confined to geography and topography. The very manners and customs of the people, to a great extent, are similar to those of Bible times. While there may be but few localities (although there are doubtless some) where there still remain remnants of the old Israelitish inhabitants of Palestine, it must not be forgotten that the people who, for more than a thousand years, have controlled the public mind of that land, namely, the Arabs, are ethnologically a sister nation of the Hebrews and closely related to the latter by national traits and peculiarities. And then that conservatism and intense clinging to all that is traditional, which is so characteristic of Oriental nations, and which is such a rock of offence to the progressiveness and unrest of western Aryan civilization, has really, in the Providence of God, been an important aid in preserving the traits of the Bible lands and people for a generation of scholars who could appreciate and utilize them. In spite of the work of centuries, in spite of the fact that Jerusalem has been seventeen times destroyed and the old city lies buried deep down under the present site, and the other towns and villages of the land have shared this fate, yet Palestine on

the whole, in both land and people, has a wonderful similarity to the state of affairs mentioned and presupposed in the Biblical records. That trading is still done in the manner in which Abraham bought the burial ground for Sarah from the Hittites; that the primitive Biblical methods of agriculture are still preserved; that at Bethlehem people still salute each other as did Boaz and his reapers, are only a few examples of how the turmoils and upheavals of twenty and more centuries have not been able to change except in a measure the characteristics of land and people. Full and reliable information of the results in this field are best to be secured from the work of Thomson already mentioned.

But investigations have been going on with equal ardor in other Bible lands. The geographical position of the Holy Land was such that its people came into contact with all the nations of the world. Itself, politically, of but little importance, its possession was an important matter for its mightier neighbors in striving for the realization of what was the ideal of ancient statecraft, namely, the establishment of a world-empire. Not only with the smaller peoples, such as the Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites, and Philistines, but also with the powerful Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians and Persians, was the fate of Israel often bound up. In all these lands, too, Biblical investigations have been made with exceptionably favorable results.

Not the least is this the case in regard to Egypt. While it is true that, with one single exception—and even that not absolutely certain—the hieroglyphics do not contain any direct references to the Israelites and their sojourn in Egypt, yet these same records, in everything that they give concerning the old customs and manners of the Egyptians, agree with and confirm, even in the smallest minutiæ, the

Egyptian historical data and background of Genesis and Exodus and the statements of later books. The researches in Egypt have had not only an apologetic value, but have also contributed positively to the interpretation of a number of passages referring to that classic land. The farther the investigations have proceeded the more and more has it appeared that where Herodotus and other smaller historians do not agree with the Biblical accounts of Egypt, the latter, on the basis of the native records, prove to be correct. Indeed, the Egyptian references of the Pentateuch are becoming more and more one of the best indirect proofs of the historical and Mosaic character of these books. Only within the past two years have new evidences of great value been added. Chiefly through the researches of M. Naville have the great storehouses built by the Israelites in old Goshen for the Egyptian king, of which mention is made in the opening chapters of Exodus, been rediscovered and excavated. An interesting account of this is found in *Harpers' Magazine*, Oct., 1886, and in the *Century*, entitled, The finding of Pharaoh—May, 1887. The best summary of the Egypt contribution to the explanation of the Bible is Eber's, Egypten und die fünf Bücher Moſes.

One of the most remarkable and gratifying finds in this line within the past five years has been the actual rediscovery of a once powerful Oriental people, of whom nearly all traces had been lost in secular literature, and the references to whom in the Bible were often made the base of a charge of an unhistorical character. The nation here in question are the Hittites. The Old Testament frequently mentions this people. Abraham bought his family burying-place from Ephron the Hittite. Esau married two wives that were Hittites (Gen. 16, 34). They are constantly named among

the tribes that inhabited the land of Canaan before the conquest of Joshua. Abimelech and Uriah, the noted warriors of David, were Hittites. It was a strong nation, for with them the people of Israel drove a profitable trade in horses and war chariots. Cf. 1 Kings 10, 29, and 2 Chron. 1, 17. The nation is described as being so powerful that, when Ben-Hadad was besieging the city of Samaria (2 Kings 7, 6), and when, in order to deliver the city, the Lord "made the hosts of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses," "the Syrians said one to another: Lo! the king of Israel has hired against us the *kings of the Hittites* and the kings of the Egyptians." So much was its power dreaded that the Syrian hosts fled precipitately.

And yet secular history is silent on this people. It can not cause wonder that these Biblical references have been used to impugn the historical character of the Old Testament. And yet the recent discoveries in Asia Minor, Egypt and Babylonia have brought to light evidences in abundance that this people not only existed, but were a most important factor for many decades in the political ups and downs of Western Asia. As long as ten years ago Dr. Schliemann found on the ancient site of Troy curious monuments and vases whose style was neither Greek nor Egyptian. These have since proved to be the relics of the old Hittites. Recently deciphered hieroglyphics have also brought new evidences. These say that after the expulsion of mysterious shepherd kings, King Thotmes III., the greatest warrior of the Pharaohs, made fourteen campaigns to the northeast. The hieroglyphics say that the chief opposition that he met was the ancient nation of the Hittites, whose southern capital was at Kadesh, near Damascus, north of Palestine. On one occasion the Egyptians captured from

the Hittites 924 war chariots, 31 of which were plated with gold. Later than this their king, Sapalel, negotiated a treaty with Rameses I., king of Egypt. Seti I., the next Pharaoh, and Rameses II., the ruler who oppressed Israel, marched against the Hittite capital. Of this latter march, the Egyptian king chiseled upon various temple walls in Egypt a triumphal poem and a great battle picture, fifty-eight feet long and twenty-five feet high. The peace made is expressly stated to have been one equally favorable to Egyptians and Hittites—a confession that proves conclusively that the latter must have equalled in power the former nation.

Still more recently have cuneiform inscriptions been found in the valley of the Euphrates with fresh data concerning the Hittites. According to these their northern capital was Carchenish, the famous city on the western bank of the Euphrates not far from Babylon, and it is further learned that the Hittites were a powerful nation as far back as the days of Sargon I., the great conquerer of Western Asia, twenty-four hundred years before Christ.

Relics and ruins of the smaller nations that surrounded Israel have also been discovered, but not yet in any abundance. Prominent among these is a Moabite stone, the only native written or rather chiseled records we possess of these cousins of the Israelites. It was discovered by the German missionary Klein in 1868, and contains an account of the defeat of the Moabites by King Joram of Israel, of which we have the Biblical record in 2 Kings, 2. Of the Phœnicians too relics have been found, as late as twelve months ago. At Sidon, in May of last year, a great grave-chamber was struck containing a number of richly decorated caskets. The Turkish savant Handi Bey, of Constantinople, claims that one of these is the casket of Alexander the Greek, but

western scholars are ridiculing the idea, since it is historically settled that the young fool world-conquerer was buried in his own city Alexandria, in Egypt. The excavations at Sidon are being taken up again this spring and interesting developments are expected.

But surpassing in importance all these already mentioned for Biblical importance are the discoveries made in the ruins of ancient Nineveh and Babylon. Not only have the remains of at least a dozen grand palaces been unearthed, all kinds of utensils, vases, etc., etc., indicative of an ancient and hitherto entirely unknown civilization, but an entirely new literature has also been found. This is the so-called cuneiform or "wedge-form" literature, so termed because the letters, or rather syllables, are a combination of from two to twelve and more wedges, variously arranged and pressed into soft clay tablets, which were then burned hard. Literally tens of thousands of these engraved bricks have been found, especially at old Nineveh, and as the wedges are all small it is possible to get upon a brick eight inches square about half as much information as upon an octavo page printed in average large type. A whole library has been discovered in the palace of Assurbanipal, covering all the departments of knowledge known to the Chaldeans. The literature of the cuneiform inscriptions embrace poetry and prose, the former in epics—of which there are two—lyrics and other kinds; the latter chiefly in history, especially the records of military campaigns, many of them of well known Biblical character, as Shalnamesser, Nebuchadnezzer, Sargon and others, and embracing also accounts of the Assyrian expeditions against Israel, revealed in the books of Kings and Chronicles. But besides these historical records there are others covering nearly all relations

of public and privite life, even down to business transactions, bills and receipts, contracts public and private, formulas of incantation, etc., etc. Scarcely any of the ancient literatures is so varied in contents and so ancient as that engraved on the tablets of Nineveh and Babylon.

Of special interest to Bible students, beside the historical documents running parallel with the records of Scriptures, is the religious literature of this people. In one of the great epics, of which the Biblical Nimrod is the hero, there is also found an account of creation and of the flood, which have a most remarkable similarity with those of the Bible, both of which go even further into details than the Bible accounts; angelology and demonlogy is extensively developed and as far as names go remind one strongly of the Bible; religious psalmody exists in great abundance and is varied in Kings (c. f. for particulars on the last point, Dr. Brown's article in the *Presbyterian Review*, Jan., 1888.

Although European scholars have been laboring for twenty and more years on the decipherment of these inscriptions, the materials accumulated on their hands more rapidly than they can be utilized. In the British Museum there are yet thousands of tablets and cylinders that have not been called up to tell their tale. Some abuse as well as use has been made by scholars with the information thus gained. The chronological system of the Old Testament, a *crux interpretum* that scarcely has its equal, is by some thrown aside as useless because it cannot be made to agree with Assyrian records; some of the leading facts of Revelation, such as the account of creation and the flood and angels and the devil are claimed to have been borrowed from Assyrian sources by the sacred writers. But already the cooler heads are beginning to go a little slower in impeach-

ing Scriptures on account of real or imagined cuneiform inscription. Indeed the gain is now a positive one for Scriptures. The book of Daniel is a notable example in this direction. Subjective criticism for fifty years had claimed that this book *could* not be authentic, but that it must be a product of the Maccabees struggle. The recent discoveries have shown that the historical background of Daniel demands just that period which it claims for itself. The best work in this line is doubtless yet to be done, and interesting results can be looked for. As far as the data gained from these researches can be used for Scripture purposes, the best summary generally and a fair discussion is Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, now also to be had in English, while the best general historical account of the discoveries and the character and contents of the new literature, together with copious translations, is Kauler's *Assyrien und Babylonien, nach der neuesten Entdeckung.* 3. *Auflage.*

G. H. S.

HOME MISSION AND SUNDAY.*

Translated from the German of Rev. Hickmann by J. H. Kuhlmann.

The Sunday question is to be taken into consideration by us to-day when our General Conference may be said to end in our "*Special Conferenz*" just as did Paul's Epistle to the Romans, with meekness keenly whetted and never antiquated to do battle against Rome and her fundamental doc-

*The original of this is an address delivered before the *Special Conferenz* of the *General Lutheran Conference* convened at Hamburg in Oct., 1887. The full title reads: "The Task of Home mission with reference to Sunday Joys."—Ed.

trine of faith, terminates in the 12th chapter with its description of the self-sacrificing life of the Christian, and with its instruction also on all work of Christian charity.

This is not the first time that Sunday has been discussed at the General Lutheran Conference. Already at its second meeting in 1870, at Leipsic, the social significance of Sunday occupied its attention. To-day, therefore, I shall pass by the material of learned, historical research and theoretical discussion, simply referring you for the special appreciation of the social significance of Sunday to the address delivered at that time by Dr. G. Uhlhorn, and which still belongs to the best we have on the Sunday question, and this I do in order that I may without delay hold up to view our theme in its *particular* setting.

Three things are evidently expressed in the theme: 1. that Sunday and joy belong together; 2. that not every joy of our people on Sunday is a healthy Sunday-joy, is not that joy which belongs to Sunday, and that, therefore, 3. the duties of the Church's home mission are not to invent a Sunday-joy, but to bring together again our people's Sunday and that healthy joy which belongs to it.

Sunday and joy! How according to their idea they belong together, the Sabbath abolished for the church of Christ as regards its legal compulsion, but not only regenerated out of the Gospel in the Christian Sunday, but also arrived at its fulfillment, and joy, the joy of being apprehended and of apprehending, of tasting in the having and of foretasting in the hoping — paradise, paradise how very sweet thy fruit!—this the Church herself could not have testified to more strongly, than when she wished to preserve for Sunday, even during the serious passion season, the joyous and festive character of the day of our Lord's resurrection. Sun-

day and joy—how they belong together, especially for our German people throughout a long period of custom-producing history, is sung as well in the spiritual as in the secular songs of our people. Koegel, in his well-known beautiful discourse, has combined these chimes of song from every German province as "A poetic geography and statistics of Sunday." Let us at this time and place think of at least three: of Uhland in the South, whose hundreth birthday we have celebrated this year, and of those two in the North, the noble Matthias Claudius, whose tomb we have yonder outside of Hamburg's gates, and Klaus Groth who is still living. And one artist above all others, the amiable master, in sentiment a colleague of the "Wandsbecker Bote," Ludwig Richter, has portrayed for us this belonging together, for he like none other has been able to understand how to look at the bright side of German character.

Now, while we are speaking about the enjoyment of Sunday, and as it were for a grateful memorial due to a great painter, both of German and of Christian joy, let us be reminded of one of his pictorial works which bears the title "Sunday," not as a mere ornament for our diction, but because it will aid us materially. But how does Ludwig Richter paint healthy Sunday-joy in this work, on whose title-page Sunday is represented as a light-enveloped child of heaven, beckoning toward the cross as it comes down to men in their every-day work? There are nine pages. On the first a plain citizen's family is at home conducting morning worship. On the second the roads are becoming filled with joyful church-goers, while one of the children, which has remained at home, is reading to the crippled grandmother from the old house-postil. On the third, poor and rich, young and old, are thoughtfully listening to the sermon. On

the fourth love visits the sick and the lonely. Then with joyful step the whole family, with "Spitz" in the van, hastens out into God's beautiful nature. Then (an especially charming picture) the family of a friend is visited, where a hearty welcome meets them, and the host with his whole family is no less pleased than are the large and small guests. Then a seventh picture portrays the stillness of the church-yard or cemetery, into which the vesper-bells are ringing. And now, having been refreshed, we see them wending their way homeward again, the little ones led by father's hand or carried on mother's arm, the older children still singing ahead and laden down with booty, not of that kind purchased at the noisy Sunday-fair, but with flowers and mosses. And now at last, after the close of the evening worship, while the angels are lighting the stars, a peaceful "good night!" at which you notice again the joy of the whole family, both mother and children, at once more having enjoyed so fully the company of the father, reminding us of the words of that English laborer's child: "Sunday is the day when people love each other." What do these pictures tell us about healthy Sunday-joy?

I think, again three things. First, that to it self-evidently belongs the joy on account of the especial grace with which God has endowed Sunday, as a day not only of sacred rest from work, but also as the day of that resting in God during which the Spirit of the Lord is busy with the heavenly nourishing of the soul through Word and Sacrament, the precious day of a united celebration of God's great deeds, of the communion of the praying and praising congregation with Him who is present. But secondly, just as well as this other also, that Sunday being, like the Sabbath, instituted for the sake of man, may and should bring to him and oth-

ers that leisure, to the end that then especially that innate craving of the human soul after joy, refreshment, solace, recreation and social intercourse, without the satisfaction of which man would become a mere laboring machine, have an opportunity to assert its right, of course, always under the regulation and direction of a Christian conscience. No world-renouncing, self-imposed, or even proud and ostentatious fasting in such Sunday joy is a testimonial of advanced Christian knowledge, but, on the contrary, what is required is a child-like, happy and thankful appreciation of this joy, as an essential portion of that daily bread which our dear Heavenly Father has prepared for His children, especially on Sunday, and, according to His paternal manner, has prepared in abundance. Sunday is the pearl of all days for body and soul, for hand and foot, eye and heart. Our Father in Christ Jesus—to follow in somewhat the words of a pious Swabian—no doubt for the sake of our education, has seen to it that our life at best remains a hospital, but being solicitous of our welfare, he has also seen to it that the hospital garden beside it ("Hospitalgaertle dran) be not wanting. And what do Richter's pictures tell us in the third place. That the soil on which healthy Sunday joy blooms and flourishes is found above all in the home, that is, taking home in the widest sense of the word. Yes, perhaps Richter can even teach us through the silence of his pencil. Had he not intended to portray Sunday joy as it is still to be found in the present, had he perhaps tried to paint it as it was among the German people in past centuries, then, no doubt, the jolly sports of the young people out under the village linden-tree, guarded by the merry but at the same time watchful eye of father or mother, would not have been wanting. But where did the present still offer to the artist

studies for such a picture of common, healthy Sunday joy, which, without screening of reality and without internal contradiction, could have been classed with those other pictures?

This then at once leads us to the fact which forms the presupposition of our theme, to-wit: that to wide circles of our people a healthy Sunday joy is wanting, even if through any fault of their own or of others Sunday itself have not been taken from them.

Does this require a detailed proof? Proof enough are our papers with their announcements for Sunday and their police reports concerning Sunday. We all know it. There are thousands among our people, many thousands, who no longer know the elevating, purifying and reconciling power of a pure Sunday joy, whether it be that which God's house or that which the Christian home affords. Thousands there are, educated and uneducated, men and women, whose Sundays contain nothing more for them than labor, or ennui, or public amusement, be it in a grosser or a finer form. Poor people are they who think about nothing else than how they can best kill Sunday, because they have forgotten how to derive life from it. And others stand ready and help them destroy Sunday, because they live off of Sunday wasted in sin. In speculation on Sunday in particular new and splendid halls are springing up every day and, in spite of all pretended need, our people fill them from Sunday afternoon till late at night, not only the single youth, but also men and women, fathers and mothers, who know no other pleasures any more; and among them there are people who have already been compelled to go through so much care and trouble, that a person cannot comprehend how they can do such things. During this time the children

at home are famishing for want of parental love, and that of a Sunday! Where the innkeepers are not allowed to give public dances with music, they will establish, under various forms and various names, perhaps even under the sign-board of Christian charity, societies of amusement. Yes, even the nearer and farther excursions into God's nature, which might become such a rich fountain of healthy family joy, are, on account of the prevailing immoderate pleasure-seeking and the advantage that innkeepers take of this, more and more becoming means to the same end, giving occasion not only to immoderate expenses, consuming the greater part of the week's wages, but also to temptation for the young to early pleasure-seeking. Who, like I, lives in a romantic spot of earth, from which every Sunday the proverbial grey cavalcade rides back to the metropolis, can sing a tune concerning the nuisance of such Sunday pleasure, but not a pleasant one. Each one can doubtless add a painful picture from his own experience, and I say it no doubt with universal assent, that *the present prevailing character of the Sunday joy of our people forms a sad accusation against the condition of its Christian, congregational and family life.*

And did we not tell ourselves, then the observers of our people in foreign lands would call our attention to it. Even if we could not admit to Americans, that their materials for observation in New York are sufficient in order to form from them an impartial opinion of our whole people, nevertheless, serious enough to us is the well-known complaint from there concerning "the hatred of the German lager-beer worshipers toward the American Sunday." Of course, also in other times gross Sunday sins have not been wanting. But at that time existing Christian Sunday customs still exerted a protecting influence on many who despised the real bless-

ing of Sunday; but now these dams are washed away nearly everywhere, and for the multitude the step from looseness of morals to open licentiousness is not far.

And what an abundance of corruption, both in a material and ideal direction, does not our people drink from such an intoxicating teacher of sinful Sunday pleasure, because they no longer draw from the spring of healthy Sunday joy. No other day produces so much loss of domestic welfare and conjugal peace, so much ruin of body and soul, so much destruction of the chastity and fidelity of our youth. The most crimes, especially the great majority of crimes against life, and also the so-called crimes against morality, occur on Sunday. Well known is *v. Oettingen's* reference to the influence of Sunday sins on suicide. And even if such extremes are not reached, with what a want of real exhilaration and recreation, of satisfying and reconciling influence, of weapons against the bitterness and ill-humor of egotism do men and women after such a Sunday pleasure go to work again, if blue Monday does not continue their work of destruction. And just in this sort of Sunday pleasure, moreover, one certain evil has its main-spring and in which evil, with all my aversion to exaggerations and to panaceas of every kind, I find a chief source of the social evils of the present, and also one of the reasons for the still continuing increase of social dissatisfaction and of parties inimical to the state. I mean those early marriages at an age of moral and partly also bodily immaturity. How many premature marriage-ties are contracted on Sunday, not under the chaste sunlight, not beside the cozy flames of the domestic hearth, but in the eye, mind and soul-confusing glare of the dancing-hall, or under cover of darkness on the way home. Thus from families that are not really families,

continually new families spring without the right family character, families in which, when the earnestness of life comes, nothing, absolutely nothing of that comfort is felt, of which Paul Fleming, born in the Erzgebirge of Saxony, deceased at Hamburg, so beautifully sings: "Joy is mine in greatest trial, for I know a heart that's loyal."

I hope I may be excused from going farther into the particulars of the need lying before us. But if the need is there, our theme has its right. For where need is crying, there the Christian hears a call for help and comes to the rescue. "A Christianity," thus Uhlhorn has told us in our first treatment of the Sunday question, "which withdraws itself from the world, and then out of its isolated corner knows nothing else to do than to complain of the corruptness of the world, is not capable of solving the problems of the present. Therefore, a healthy Sunday-joy for our people, not to be longed for only, but to be brought about and with it the healing of a deep public wound, is the duty also of the Church. Or "is it not lawful to heal on the Sabbath day?"

Especially home mission, the love born out of the faith of the Church, must not be in doubt about this; does it apply to every department, be it the press, the lodging-house system, or whatever it may that the battle against evil can be fought successfully only by offering the good, then certainly the same applies here also. Perhaps we may nevertheless have a duty before us for which our Lord has by no means left the Church without the requisite talent, but with which she should yet practice usury to a much greater extent. Perhaps also a not unimportant observation for our carrying on of home mission work meets us here. Have we not perhaps, when we received impulses from other lands

and other dioceses for a more vigorous organization of the work of seeking, preserving and saving charity, impulses for which it certainly does not behoove us Lutherans to be ungrateful, have we not then perhaps also fashioned the method of our work too much according to patterns that originated on different ground? and, therefore, perhaps also paid too little attention to the necessity of a healthy, popular Sunday-joy? Have we perhaps from sheer anxiety that its satisfaction might receive the censure, "worldly," in reality driven many into the arms of the world? Have we concerned ourselves too little about the publican, that we might on no account give offense to several pharisees? May it suffice for the present, even at the risk of contradiction, to have stated the question. Even if I am contradicted in all the particulars, just so this sentence is conceded to me: "The bringing about of a healthy Sunday-joy for our people is our duty." That is the principal thing about which I am concerned.

But my theme speaks about duties. It requires, therefore, that I speak of certain paths which have been or can be traveled, on which love can work at the fulfillment of these duties. Let us then attempt it. Only when I speak of the Church's home mission, I think not only of her work as a society, but of her whole activity, whether it consists in proclaiming the Word or in deeds of brotherly love, whether it be officially organized or voluntary service, in so far as she is destined, both in regard to her measures for the whole body as also for her work among individuals, to take up the battle against the estrangement of our people from church, Christianity and morals. For just in so far is her work home mission.

And, therefore, my words refer first of all to my brethren in office. That, indeed, is still the best and most indis-

pensable Sunday-joy, which we shepherds should bring to the flock through the pure doctrine of God's free grace in Christ. Let us then, as messengers of joy, make everything serviceable to us, so that we may also outwardly make our worship a joy for our people, both big and little. Psalter and harp, awake! More and more our Church must learn how to coin with pedagogical wisdom for the congregations the pure gold which the Lord has laid especially into her hands through the services of a *Loehe*, a *Shoeberlein* or a *Kliefoth*. Blessed every parochial school-teacher who aids our congregations in obtaining vigorous congregational singing, blessed every teacher who knows how to make the singing of beautiful spiritual songs a pleasure to his pupils, blessed the seminary at which is found enthusiasm and sympathy for this so great a service to our people waiting on its students.

We should also, as much as possible, persuade the congregation to participate in adorning the house and worship of God, even if it be in seeming trifles. In my country congregation, having indeed a partly suburban character, a church-choir of thirty-six members graces the festivals. In the children's service twenty female assistants, of different stations and divided into different groups, without having intrusted to them (according to the more elaborate system of the so-called Sunday-school) the instruction of children, assist full of love and pleasure, with a blessed influence that reaches far beyond Sunday. From Pentecost on until late in autumn the members of the congregation alternate in adorning the altar every Sunday with bunches of flowers, freshly plucked from their gardens.

Above all, it is important to adorn emblematically the festivals of the Church-year, with Christmas at the head, so

that it is a real pleasure to the congregation, and should there be a fitting opportunity of increasing the wreath of church festivals, then we should make use of it. In my congregation, for instance, Misericordias Domini, the anniversary of our children's service, has naturalized itself as such a joyful festival of the sanctuary. On this day our church is filled with the sweet scent of spring flowers. These the children bring with them in flower-pots, as an ornament to the altar place, and especially to the baptismal font, and after the close of the service they take them home with them again. I confess, that in the arrangement of this festival, I was guided not only by the churchly significance of especially this Sunday, but also by a recollection of my sojourn in France. I shall never forget what a very attractive influence the Catholic churches and cathedrals of France had on our soldiers in May, 1871, with their decorations of spring-flowers in honor of "Mary, the queen o' the May."

Especially important in this direction is what Prof. F. Zimmer, in Koenigsberg, has told us, during last year's Breslau conference for home missions, at which our theme was also discussed, concerning the great Sunday-joy which his evangelical choir-school procured for thousands on Sunday afternoon, in crowded churches, by giving more extensively church music combined with Scripture lessons. Thanks to him and thanks to the men who incited by him have united for the purpose of publishing or composing simple church oratorios, which can be performed also in village churches, oratorios not too large, for solo and chorus, with simple organ accompaniment, with the assistance as well of the pastor with Scripture lesson and prayer, as of the congregation in the chorus occurring at various places.

Hence these church oratorios are not to serve as ostentatious, religious concerts, or perhaps even for the glorification of several vain soloists, or merely for making money for a charitable purpose of any kind, but simply for the worship of the congregation. They are to be greeted as a valuable aid toward the enriching of popular Sunday-joy in the house of God.

In short, it is self-evident that out of Christian chastity and wisdom we will not tolerate practices strange to the sanctuary, and if they promised ever so much outward success, for "my house is a house of prayer," says the Lord. But let us make our worship testify loudly concerning the message: "Behold, I bring you glad tidings of great joy," so that for the members of the congregation, from their youth up, many glad reminiscences are connected with their church, and the Lord anoint especially us with His Spirit of joy, us poor sinners, whom He on this His day permits to be of so great service to His dearly bought congregation. How decidedly I reject every puritan exaggeration, which knows of Sunday-joy only in the form of edification, can be sufficiently seen from what I said heretofore. But shall we not also think of the sincere joy with which many pious Christians of England, in connection with their whole family, take part in the repeated and indeed highly ornamented, worship of the congregation? It is at least not fitting for those who know nothing at all about the joy of a beautiful worship of the Lord, to prescribe boundaries to the Christian for his public worship, the overstepping of which would mean pious hypocrisy or morbid enthusiasm. What do the blind know about colors? The sated famish at a well-set table. But blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness. Blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it. And to be blessed means to be happy.

But if it is a fact, moreover, that the want of a healthy Sunday-joy is above all connected with the want of Christian family life, it becomes the duty also of the shepherds of the congregation in our days to be doubly diligent in their testimony in sermon, instruction and pastoral care, not perhaps after a sad recipe to supplant the sound and only life-giving doctrine with morals, but rather to place the family life together with the Sundays of the family thoroughly and concretely into the light of the Word concerning that faith which works through love. Do we wish to preach intelligibly, do we wish to awake repentance, do we wish to further the new life, then we must lead our members into their homes, we must teach them there to prove their works of faith in humility and self-denial, patience and meekness, and there to sit in judgment over their sins. This is also what Luther aims at in his instruction concerning Confession. It is significant, that just in the report about the two first conversions on European ground, it says: Lydia and her house, the keeper of the prison and his house. In the family we need passages not only like the house-tables of Paul's epistles, but also passages like his canticle of love, 1 Corinthians 13, this precious house-remedy also for private worship. I would not mention this, if I did not know from the mouth of an Ephor who is sincerely devoted to home missions, that many ministers understand the apostolic admonition to love first or even exclusively in the sense of an admonition to the works of home mission in the narrower sense of the word. They certainly do not understand the wants of our congregations. And how many opportunities the gospels from Epiphany to St. Michael's Day, give us to speak about the Sunday-joy of the home, especially of the sacred duty of parents to make Sunday joyful to their

children! And with these teachings, prayers and admonitions this should go hand in hand, that we, particularly and publicly, especially on days of repentance, with a loud voice and without circumvention, chastise the evils which poison the Sunday-joy of our people, even at the risk of stepping on some one's toes, as well as the habitual saloon-going and at least also among us in Saxony this luxuriously growing association-fever. But to the testimony of the word belongs the testimony of the deed.

And is Sunday-joy to have its first place next to the house of God in the Christian home, it becomes the first duty, not only of all the servants, but also of all the living members of the Church, and therefore also of her voluntary helpers in Christian works of love, that, before they carry on home mission among others, they should after the manner of Luther set a good example of healthy Sunday-joy to their fellow-members in their own homes. That this joy should shine and ring and sing out of every Christian home, a joy that makes Sunday sunny especially for children, so that they take with them out into foreign lands and into their prospective own homes recollections of the beautiful Sundays spent in their father's house. Oh that many fathers would think of this, who out of pretended love for their family make of Sunday a day of labor! "Mine shall not want," they say, and all the while they let them be in want of the best that one man can procure for another. Oh that many a mother, who also on account of pretended duties does not learn how to practice the beautiful art of love, would let her children enjoy a mother's love! An illustration of 1 Corinthians 13, 1–3. Yes, would to God that the rays of a pure Sunday-joy would stream, and ring, and sing out spontaneously from every Christian home and so that they might arrest and move the whole neighborhood!

The guests of the house should also partake of it. And hence the guests should also come in that love which seeks nothing else; not therefore as disturbers of domestic Sunday-joy, be it to the detriment of the little ones or perhaps also of the servants. For also for these, even when they do not have their Sunday free, the Sunday of the Christian home should be so constituted, that they can participate in the joy of the day. Of course, when their free Sunday comes we can not constrain them by law in the use of their freedom in Christian Sunday-joy, or prescribe to them to take part in the Sunday-reunion, for the law works wrath, but love educates. Nevertheless, Christian masters should not merely for fear of causing vexation, allow their servants to indulge in abuses of their freedom. Also in this direction many good Christians, both in the city and in the country, sin frequently, when for example out of sheer convenience they give the door-key to the servants. It is a trifle, but how great a ruin often arises from small causes!

The duty of not having the Sunday in the home without the sunlight of all kinds of lawful enjoyment, will devolve especially also upon those, yes perhaps even require their studious attention, who as housefathers or housemothers preside over the house-congregation at our institutions for home missions. There are houses of refuge whose inmates are envied by other children on account of their Sunday-joy, but there are also institutions in which the quietude of Sunday, in contrast to the working-day, finds its expression in the one terrible word "ennui," yes, in which perhaps only a much greater loneliness and much less love is felt on Sunday than on working-days. That should not be.

Finally, before we leave this domain, another word to

home missions. Since Sunday and the Christian home are to depend upon each other, home missions should be very careful not to further the separation of the family. I decidedly object to it, not only in my theory, but also in my practice, if evangelical men's societies hold their regular weekly meetings on Sunday afternoon. A pastor must certainly sacrifice everything, even the Sunday-joy of his own family, when his duty calls him to his members, in order to be a partaker of their joy or of their consolation. But his good friends should not only see clearly that it does not behoove the pastor to seek his Sunday recreation in the casino or at the club table, but also that he should not be required to spend every Sunday evening of the year away from home and at the meeting of some Christian society. It is certainly true that Monday is a pleasant day to the pastor; were I a poet, I could sing a song of it and its peculiar charm. But what is this to the children who must go to school? Then too it is to be hoped that the school also does not sin against by robbing them of Sunday. And should at times the faithful, evangelical pastor be worried by the thought, that the celibacy of the Romish priest allows the latter to be more active in all kinds of society-work, all the more weighty to such a pastor should be the certainty of the streams of blessing which have always gone out into the life of our people from a genuine evangelical home-life at the parsonage, of course only to the comfort of the faithful, not as a palliation of laziness, luxury or that narrow-mindedness which does not think beyond its four walls.

But how, to go beyond the home itself, shall we aid others in obtaining a Christian Sunday-joy?

There, of course, first in order are those homes in which it is necessary, according to the instruction of St. James, to

bring consolation and joy to those who are in sorrow, pain and loneliness. And certainly "our" poor and sick belong to our home in the wider sense of the word. This the above picture of Richter tells us, and also this that we accustom already our children to such works of love. On that picture a girl walking by her mother's side is carrying a greeting of love to a sick friend. I will not let it pass unmentioned here, that I consider it important, both for the sick and the healthy, that the minister, and especially that minister who is himself very busy on Sunday, gather around him a circle of assistants who prepare a Sunday-joy for those sick whose spiritual wants cannot be attended to otherwise, by visiting them and reading to them. It is by no means necessary, that this circle be organized after the manner of a society. Also here I refer you to the example of the evangelical choir-school in Kœnigsberg, whose choirs, influenced by ministers, city missionaries, and deaconesses, every Sunday gratuitously sing spiritual songs in the houses of the sick. I will here mention also that the vestry of my congregation, for my own and my assistants' use, keeps up a library for the sick, independent of the people's library, in which for instance Dieffenbach's tracts for the sick are not wanting. I will mention also the well known flower mission, in whose service charitable women of Copenhagen and other places every Sunday carry flower-greetings to the sick in the hospitals, and finally to the cards with Scripture passages issued by the institution of Bethel, into which cards is made an incision for fastening several flowers, in order thus to unite in them both God's greeting from earth and from heaven. Again nothing but trifles; but what great blessings often proceed from small causes! The work of home mission requires a sense for small things.

But our duty does not end here. We must also fight against the baneful Sunday-joy. And will it suffice here that we meet its worst symptoms? To this I count for instance those measures which check the excess of public amusements (limitation of their number, restriction of societies organized especially for the purpose of masking in some way the dance and the music, etc.), and also forbid the youth to participate in them at too early an age. Of course with these measures this must go hand in hand, that Christians do all they can to encourage church-vestries in carrying them out. To this I count also the influencing of the church-vestry, and through them of the congregation, that at least for the sake of decency they do not permit their daughters to take part in public amusements without being under parental care.

And if Sunday-joy and home belong together, then, in spite of all adverse experiences, we must persist untiringly in our efforts, as well by way of petition as by entreaty and expostulation to induce employers to restore to the laboring classes their Sunday, and the whole of it, too. To accomplish this, (to speak of which at length this is not the place,) the payment of wages should not be transferred to Saturday, and the Saturday-work of laboring women should be limited to the forenoon. What a gain it would be not only for thousands of mail-officials but also for thousands of office and counting-house clerks, if on Sunday there would be at least but one distribution of the mail, and that one not until 11 o'clock in the forenoon. May God raise up for our "Reichstag" many men with the courage, insight and perseverance of a Wilberforce, the slave liberator in the English Parliament; and he who directs mens' hearts like water courses procure them a hearing with the "Reichstag" and

the Chancellor. And has Sunday-joy, according to a well-known simile, the importance that a forest has for the land, well, then the lovers of the woods should prefer to plant rather than to cut down. That Stoecker through the distribution of sermons on Sunday has incited many men and women to bring to those who are without Sunday at least a greeting of brotherly love, for this we thank him here. In the same manner and with his joyful consent our Tract Association has undertaken for good reason to edit and publish these sermons for our land, though at a greater expense, on better paper and with clearer type.

If Sunday-joy and home belong together then also this consideration must help to incite and further the efforts which are directed toward bettering the dwelling-places of poorer classes. I am surprised that no more pains are taken to lay out land in the vicinity of factories in gardens, and then to rent them cheap to laborers' families. I once visited the town of Hoeganaes, not far from Helsingburg on the Swedish coast. There, already several decenniums ago, a warm-hearted and far-seeing man succeeded, through social and Christian aid, in raising a degraded population of laborers to a moral and intellectual standard, and in bringing back to a flourishing condition an industry that had been given up as hopeless. Among the many arrangements which I learned to know here, one was especially precious to me. Out beyond the town there lay, leaning against a hill, a large green meadow surrounded on all sides by nothing but bowers, one of which belonged to each laborer's family. The name of the factory-director shone out from the green of the hill in great flower-letters, which the laborers out of gratitude planted at his death, and which they were still gratefully and faithfully tending. How much joy can such a garden create for young and old! "Whoever has no joy," said Ernst Moritz Arndt one time, "runs after pleasure." Perhaps we can also add a small building-stone to God's temple of pure Sunday-joy, if we aid in placing benches in such beautiful and shady nooks

of the woods where, as an exception, no restaurant can be found. I at least have long since been compensated by such secluded spots for the expenses which they incurred, through Sunday afternoons spent there by members of my congregation. Again nothing but trifles. But the stones with which David went out to meet the great giant, the terribly armed Philistine and with which as the "Wandsbecker Bote" has it, he knocked that big hole into his head, were not large rocks either, but small, smooth stones picked out of the brook by the wayside.

If Sunday-joy and home belong together, then we will not forget to recommend to the family for winter use good treasures in word and picture, and to make them easy of access. To the wealthy we would recommend Schnorr's Picture-Bible, Nink's "On Biblical Paths" and one or the other of Richter's works; to those less able Schoenherr's Picture-Bible, which was recently published by J. Naumann in Leipsic. Dore's Bible we would not recommend to any German home, but to every one the House-Bible and the House-Postil, of great service also in this direction is a well selected people's library, put into a convenient place and opened at proper times. Thanks also to those men who write good Sunday tracts for our work in the Christian home, both to them who still wield the pen and to those whose hand is at rest. Out of gratitude to the sainted Ninck, and as an encouraging proof of the still existing susceptibility for such spiritual food, I will mention here that in my congregation of about 4,000 souls, not through my own merit but that of my assistants, there are distributed every Sunday, besides the other church papers, 260 copies of the "Nachbar," so that there are very few houses in which at least one family does not receive a Sunday-greeting. And how else could we prevent it, that baneful Sunday-messengers in the shape of pernicious books, enter our homes, messengers that poison and destroy Sunday.

But dare we stop here? Do the privilege of Sunday-joy and our duty end here? I would gladly stop here, for I am

now placing my foot on difficult ground, on which misunderstandings easily occur. But dare we pass by unnoticed or with simply a rebuke, the inclination of our people toward a Sunday-joy in association also with wider circles? Certainly not; and since nearly everywhere this inclination toward association is taken advantage of by societies, organized solely for the purpose of pleasure, the Church cannot do otherwise, she must for the sake of love do her part to meet the wants of our youth, especially those of the male sex—wants both in regard to social intercourse and to recreation. Also we who live in the country, as things are at present, need the Ev. Lutheran young men's society, much as I rejoice at it that one of my deacons does not send his two sons to this society, because the family does not wish to be separated on Sunday evening; but that is only an exception. For most young men also in the country, though the local question there is often very difficult, we need the Ev. Lutheran young men's society, need it besides for other reasons which do not concern us now, also for the purpose of preserving from a bad and of training toward a pure and healthy Sunday-joy. In this aim also this is expressed, that the young men's society, though it as well as the Christian home should be hallowed by God's Word and prayer, and must therefore close with evening worship, does not exist for the purpose of offering to its members that edification which they should find in the house of God. Therefore, to seek this diligently there is made one of the duties imposed on entering the society. It simply exists for the purpose of offering to its members, in inventive love and after a good German fashion under the regulation of a Christian conscience, a rich and healthy joy. I also repeat here that the minister, though the leader of the society, does not belong there every Sunday evening, but he must seek and train up for himself assistants, by setting them a good example by his hearty and joyous intercourse with his young people. Still the society requires sacrifices of time and strength in thoughtful love and unvarnished humility; but it is well worth the while. And if such a gathering of the youth is

already absolutely necessary in the simple country congregations, how much more must this be the case in our cities! Here we should bless and also gladly assist every work of love which interests itself in the homeless which flock together here every Sunday; also the work of those women —would that there were many more such!—who not only call the single female youth into their societies, but also have that art of love which knows how to make a real pleasure out of such intercourse. And may God's blessing rest not only on the society, but also on every Christian home that in kindness throws its doors open on Sunday, be it to a student or clerk far from his home, or be it to a lonely seamstress. Such hospitality can perform wonderful deeds and reap great blessings.

But how is it about the necessity for recreation, also outside of the home and in a larger society for the congregation? Certainly our aim can only be that our people again learn to seek and find their regular Sunday-joy in the house of God, in the Christian house and in God's world outside. But just as the Sunday worship in the house of God at certain places reaches the height of festival worship, in the same manner we cannot absolutely and unconditionally deny that our people need a joy brought about by a larger society and offering especial pleasures to both eye and ear, but we must also place it under the judgment of an enlightened Christian conscience. Therefore in conclusion I cannot refrain from making a double remark. In the first place, as much as I have been speaking about our boundaries, I nevertheless agree with Ahlfeld in this, that not only we pastors, but also those bodies influenced by us, for instance, our men's and young men's societies, do nothing wrong but rather what is right, if we together with our families take part in such festivals, especially if they have their ground in the life of the congregation or of the nation. Yes, we do well if we ask the wealthier employers and the gentry to take part in them with us. Thus we do not condemn these festivals in themselves by remaining away, but rather those senseless and degenerated festivals whose aim it is simply to excite sensuality and passion.

In the second place, and this is the more important, I believe that it is also the duty of our German Lutheran Church to revive and to use those rich gifts of people's customs with which God has adorned her, in order to create such festivals. Blessed beginnings have already been made. I remind you of the well-known mission festivals in Ravensberg, and lately in the Stephan's Institution near Hanover. Had Ludwig Richter been present there, no doubt he would have found studies for a picture of healthy Sunday celebration also in our day and by a large body of people. At home among us the so-called "circuit festivals," instituted by the men's and young men's societies, and generally celebrated at some beautiful spot in the vicinity, serve a similar purpose; here and there also joint festivals of neighboring children's services; for the easiest road to the joy of the parents is through the joy of their children. In winter among us not only the family evenings of the societies, but also the so-called "parochial family evenings," serve a similar purpose. They are instituted by the minister and the church vestry, and adorned with songs by the church choir, and other exercises, and all adult members of the congregation are invited to them. At Chemnitz, in Saxony, well-attended and joyful Christian "forest festivals" have been instituted by pastors and their combined congregations, at which choir and congregational singing alternated with addresses. These addresses did not treat of the church directly, but of the glory of the forest in history, song and legend, of the trees mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, and of communications from the history of the congregation. Yes, I would certainly not understand the character of the Lutheran Church if it is not true that she has a particular gift to celebrate such festivals, and it would seem a great gain to me if the fruit of this discourse would be to encourage us to proceed further on this domain. . . . .

And although music forms the principal ornament of these festivals, should therefore all other arts be excluded? On one of these festivals a member of my congregation dis-

played beautiful magic views from Gustav Koenig's pictures of Luther's life. And does not the influence which is everywhere exerted by Herzig's Luther-play afford material for reflection? In our Saxon Erzgebirge still live recollections of the old passion-plays. Our young men's societies there have the merit of having revived this beautiful custom of the people, and the young men's societies at Chemnitz and Dresden have followed their example, also here to the joy and edification of many.

Do I perhaps think that such measures will entirely stop the trade of the devil and empty the halls of Sunday pleasure? Certainly not. But of this I am certain that they will also not be judged as wishing to expel the devil through Beelzebub, the world through the world, the flesh through the flesh, but that they will also on their part become channels through which the spirit chastises the flesh, heals wounds, and refreshes and fertilizes the life of the people, and that they are, therefore, rather to be placed under the banner of the word: "All these are yours, and ye are Christ's." And our hope is this, that with God's help they may also serve to this end so that the desire for false joy does not arise, and that those who have taken it up cast it aside again.

When, as a young candidate, I was sometimes permitted to wait on the blind, one day a blind man wanted to thank me and wish me something real good. For a long time he could not find words to express himself; finally, in broken speech and with deep emotion, he gave me a wish which I had never heard before, and of which I still think very often. He pressed my hand and said: "I, I wish you nothing but beautiful Sundays." If some one goes from us on Saturday-eve let us send with him the hearty wish of a blessed Sunday, and when we separate to-day let it be with the wish for each other and for our people: beautiful Sundays!

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VIII. AUGUST, 1888. No. 4.

HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES.

SECOND ARTICLE.

The reader of these articles is reminded that our purpose is not to set forth reasons and methods of biblical interpretation, but to point out certain principles which underlie all sound exegesis of Holy Scriptnre. To begin the study of the divinely inspired words with the presumption that these words are not clear and that the sense cannot with certainty be discovered, is to start from a principle that must vitiate the process. Such a principle inevitably leads to irreverent treatment and reckless conjecture. It discourages persevering study and opens the way for exhibiting man's own thoughts as the probable mind of the Spirit, whilst it silences all monitions of conscience, if such should arise, by suggesting that what the Lord's words leave doubtful man's judgment must decide. We have therefore spoken of the perspicuity of Scripture as a first principle of Biblical Hermeneutics. Exegesis is not the calling of him who is not convinced that the Bible is a clear revelation of God's will.

A second principle of equally fundamental importance is that

II. SCRIPTURE HAS BUT ONE SENSE.

God has communicated His will to man through the medium of words. Thoughts and feelings may be expressed to some extent by gestures and inarticulate sounds, and God has used symbolic actions and objects in His dealings with men. But the sense of such means of communication is not always clear, and it is a manifestation of God's mercy that He has revealed all which is necessary to be known by man in spoken and written language that is clear as the light. The inspired men spake the words which God gave them. "Which things also we speak," says St. Paul, "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." 1 Cor. 2, 13. "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. 1, 21. What was thus spoken is written in the Holy Scriptures for our learning. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 16. 17. The will of God expressed in the inspired words is the sense which the interpreter is to seek and set forth. The sense is but one. Two different interpretations of a passage cannot both be correct. The matter of both may be true, because it may be contained in words found elsewhere in Holy Scripture, but their truth cannot be established by the text in which these different meanings are alleged to be found. Each text has but one sense, and that one sense it is the office of devout exegesis to ascertain. We start wrong, and must end in error that may prove fatal, if we assume that any sense and every sense that may by

human ingenuity be attached to the words is the sense which is designed to be communicated by the Holy Ghost through the medium of these words.

As it is the evident intent of God to communicate His will, to the end that man might know it and be profited by it in time and eternity, the words in which it is communicated cannot contain a variety of meanings, leaving it to man's judgment to make a choice among them. This would frustrate the whole design of revelation. Even supposing it possible, as it is not, that language is capable of conveying a number of different meanings in the same sentence, such an employment of its supposed possibilities would necessarily discourage the devout student, because he has no means of knowing when he has found what the Holy Spirit designed to communicate, while it would encourage the wayward spirits who set up as interpreters to palm off their human fancies as among the manifold thoughts of God contained in the text. And if one of the many possible meanings of the words be regarded as the sense designed to be communicated, there is no means of ascertaining which of these is really the mind of the Spirit, and all exegetical work is useless because no certainty can be reached. All assurance and all faith is impossible on such an assumption. The hermeneutical principle, that each statement of Holy Scripture has but one sense, is therefore of fundamental import.

This principle is so firmly founded in reason and revelation that no Christian should hesitate a moment to accept and maintain it. For, in the first place, the nature of language is such that it does not admit the communication of different meanings at the same time by the same words. A sentence may be ambiguous, but the fact that it is so is

universally admitted to be a fault. Such a sentence necessarily leaves the reader in doubt as to what the author designed to say, if he really desired to say anything. The ambiguity is a proof that the speaker either could not, or that he would not, say clearly and unmistakably what he had in mind. But to say that God could not express Himself intelligibly is blasphemous. If it is possible at all in language to convey a clear meaning from mind to mind, it is beyond all controversy possible with God. This no Christian would think of denying. Neither does any one deny the possibility of saying unambiguously what one desires to say. Even with men this is possible. How then could the thought be entertained that it is impossible with God? But, in the second place, it would be worse, if possible, to assume that God could, but that He would not unequivocally make known His will and purpose. That would not only be declaring that the perspicuity which the Scriptures claim is a false pretense, but that the express purpose of God to save our lost race through a knowledge of the truth revealed by the Holy Spirit in Scripture is all a delusion and a snare, and that those who trust it are deceived and doomed to ruinous disappointment. God desired to make known His gracious plan of salvation, and Christians trust His Word. They are not deceived, and they shall not be confounded. The words in which He tells them of His gracious purposes and communicates His precious promises have but one sense, and that sense is so clear that all may know it.

What has been urged against this by Romanists and others, furnishes no ground for intelligent doubt.

It has been rightly maintained, indeed, that there are passages which are capable of different interpretations, and

which careful and conscientious men have interpreted differently. But that is far from proving that in such exceptional cases the words contain more than one sense, and that the diverse interpretations all equally set forth the mind of the Spirit. The utmost that instances of this kind would be claimed to prove is that the sense of such passages has not yet been with certainty ascertained. And this is readily admitted. No one denies that there is yet abundant room for exegetical labor in the interpretation of Holy Scripture. Those who most inflexibly maintain the perspicuity of the inspired writings are ever ready to admit that while the whole plan of salvation is clearly set forth so that every humble inquirer can know the truth, there are isolated texts whose meaning is not yet definitely ascertained. It must be remarked, moreover, that where different persons make different applications of the sense derived from a Scripture text, it is a mere confusion of ideas to assume that these various interpreters have found so many diverse meanings in the words. Men who apply differently the sense of a text, do not, on that account, understand the text differently. But even when interpreters do differ in the apprehension of the sense of a text, and it is conceded that the words, in the present state of our knowledge, may be construed differently, all that can be inferred is that we are not yet sure of the sense which the Holy Spirit designed to convey. There is no ground whatever for the conclusion that the words contain all the meanings which various interpreters have suggested as their probable sense. The cases in which the words are in themselves clear, but in which the contents of the words are such as to lead expositors to search for some other possible meaning than that which they plainly convey, are of a different sort, and require some fur-

ther remark. We shall recur to them later in another connection.

That the Holy Spirit has Himself taught by example, as some allege, that words may be employed to convey different senses, is a manifest misapprehension. The passage adduced in proof is that recorded in John 11, 50. "Caiphas, being high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself; but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation." Undoubtedly the high priest was thinking of giving up Jesus to death as a means of protecting the Jewish people from an incursion of the Romans for their destruction. And undoubtedly the Holy Spirit, who moved him to speak the words as high priest, had a different thought. The sacrifice of Jesus should bring salvation to all people. "That one man should die for the people" is thus supposed, evidently, to have two distinct meanings. But they meant one thing to Caiphas, who did not understand them, and another thing to the Holy Spirit, who used them in but one sense. Neither in the mind of Caiphas nor in that of the Holy Spirit did they have more than one meaning. The former only failed to understand their one only sense and wholly misapplied them. No thoughtful person will presume that both meanings were the sense which the Holy Spirit designed to convey in the words. The words of the Spirit have always but one sense.

The allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures which was so much in vogue among the Jews and some of the church fathers, and which the Romish Church continues to favor, must therefore, so far as this assumes that there is

another sense than that of the words which the interpreter must ascertain and educe as the hidden meaning of the Holy Spirit, be rejected as an illusion that is perilous in its consequences. Only when the threefold mystical sense advocated by Romanists, to wit, the allegorical, the tropological and the anagogical, is regarded as a threefold application of the one and only sense of the Holy Spirit's words, can Christians, who desire a sure and safe ground for their faith and hope, view it with anything but abhorrence? And even when such a threefold application is made, great caution is necessary to guard against misapprehension and error.

We do not mean to assert that there is no such thing as a mystical sense to be found in Holy Scripture. On the contrary such a sense is plainly indicated and must be reverently accepted. But it is not what blind guides, to the great injury of souls, have advocated under that name. There are numerous instances in which the objects described or designated by the words are designed to convey a meaning of their own. The sense of these objects or actions is not strictly the sense of the words. The latter are used to set before us the thing with its significance. This meaning of the thing presented is different from the words which set the thing before our minds. We have a sense of the thing presented, which is the mystical sense as distinguished from the sense of the words, which is the verbal sense. We shall proceed to speak further of these two, beginning with the sense of the words, which is always but one, even when they present to the mind an object or an action which is designed to be significant.

In order to guard against misunderstanding a word must be premised in regard to our terminology. We shall speak first of the sense of the words, and secondly of the

things which, in some instances, have also a signification and are designed to convey a meaning. The latter is called the mystical sense. In regard to the former it is necessary to distinguish between the use of words in their own native and proper signification and their employment in a sense which does not originally and usually belong to them. These might be called the grammatical and the tropical use of words, and be spoken of as two species of the literal sense, because in both cases it is the sense of the words that is had in view as distinguished from the sense of things, or the mystical sense. But in the English language the word literal is customarily employed to denote the original and appropriate signification of words as distinguished from the figurative use. To avoid confusion we shall therefore speak of the sense of the words as the verbal sense, and retain the customary use of the terms literal and figurative.

Whether words be employed in the sense which usage has established as their proper and ordinary signification, or for some reason which becomes apparent be employed in an unusual signification, the sense is always but one. They may be used literally and they may be used figuratively, but they can never at one and the same time have a literal and a figurative signification. The sense must be one or the other; it cannot be both. Which of the two is meant it is the office of the interpretor to ascertain, and he has not found the sense until he has ascertained it. When our Lord calls Herod a fox the reader has little difficulty to understand His words. It is a person that is spoken of, and no one imagines that the words are meant to declare that he is not a human being. He is a man, but he is cunning and crafty like the fox. That is evidently what the words mean. They are to be understood figuratively, as the nature of the

objects mentioned and the circumstances clearly indicate. But therefore they are not to be understood literally. They have only the one sense. Herod was not at the same time a rational man and an irrational brute, and the words do not say and do not imply that he was. He was literally a man who was figuratively a fox.

This example shows that the literal is not always the sense designed to be conveyed by the words. It would be folly to claim that words are used in Holy Scripture only in their literal sense. Figures of speech abound in the inspired record. But the universally admitted fact that the words have a signification of their own, and that every person accepts them in that signification unless there are manifest reasons why the author could not have used and could not have designed them to be accepted in that sense, must render us cautious. The hasty resort to figurative interpretation whenever a difficulty occurs in the sacred text is vicious. The most precious verities of our faith are in this way easily resolved into fancies that minister no strength and no comfort to the soul. Therefore in no case should the literal sense be departed from, at least so far as the substantials are concerned, in the principal passages setting forth the articles of our faith. The texts forming the seat of doctrine must be securely guarded by the children of God against unscrupulous men who would reduce the thoughts of God to the level of human reason, and therefore explain away the whole substance of divine revelation by assuring that all is figure. This does not imply that an article of faith is never figuratively expressed in Holy Scripture. But the very fact that something else than the mere words must be considered in arriving at the meaning of figurative expressions renders it evident that their interpretation is more

difficult than when words are used in their own appropriate sense, and that certainty in exegetical results would therefore not be attainable in matters of faith if these were nowhere revealed. When the truth is once plainly stated without trope or figure, and is thus indubitably proven as the mind of the Spirit, figurative words setting forth the same truth can be understood in the light of the literal passages; but if these be themselves resolved into figures, we have no light to guide us and all becomes insecure and uncertain. The unwisdom of Christian men who allow the foundations to be removed from under their feet by making concessions in this regard to irreverent rhetoricians, is astounding; and when Christian teachers themselves adopt the methods of these irreverent men and resort to figurative interpretations in order to do away with doctrines that do not commend themselves to their common sense, the thing is pitiful. If that which can be known from nature is to be the standard according to which the Bible is to be judged and its contents are to be explained, there was little need for a divine revelation, and the process which empties it of all supernatural truth renders it superfluous. Our controversy with those who reject the real presence of the Lord's body and blood in the holy sacrament of the altar is therefore one that involves much more than the doctrine immediately in question, important and precious as that is. The principle at stake is of far-reaching consequence.

Aside from the cases in which articles of faith are expressly set forth, at least as regards their essentials, which could not be certainly known if they were not expressed in plain, unfigurative words, we admit that figures are frequently used in Holy Scripture. The one and only sense of the passages in which they occur is the figurative sense.

But in no case can such a sense be accepted unless reason can be shown for departing from the literal sense.

Such a reason exists, in the first place, when a clear parallel passage requires a figurative interpretation. The Holy Spirit is unquestionably the best interpreter of His own words. When in one place He clearly expresses a truth in language literally employed, and in another place He manifestly speaks of the same subject in other words that seem to say a different thing, He gives us such an interpretation. His words used in one place explain the words used in another. Thus when our Lord says, "I with the finger of God cast out devils," Luke 11, 20, the fact that God is a Spirit suggests that the words are not to be literally received, and the parallel passage in Matt. 12, 28, "I cast out devils by the Spirit of God," explains what is meant by the figurative phrase "finger of God." But that care is necessary in searching for parallels, lest misapplications be made of inspired words and misinterpretations arise, is obvious. The instruction of our Lord in John 6 concerning the eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood, for example, are not parallel with the words used in the institution of the Holy Supper in Matt. 26. The former evidently refer to a reception of the Lord by faith; the latter refer to the body and blood as given to the communicant in bread and wine and therefore to a reception by the organ which receives the bread. It is the Holy Spirit's interpretation only when the parallel is real.

A reason for departing from the literal sense exists, in the second place, when the analogy of faith requires a figurative interpretation. The Holy Spirit who knoweth all things cannot contradict Himself. What He says in an individual passage cannot conflict with the general import

of His teaching. Hence when the truth in regard to any given point is once known from the Scriptures, this known truth becomes a guide in the interpretation of other less perspicuous texts treating of the same subject. This guide is called the analogy of faith. If the literal meaning of a passage is inconsistent with the truth once clearly ascertained from the Scriptures themselves, the words must be interpreted figuratively. Thus when the Lord says in Jer. 31, 26 that He slept and awaked from sleep, the knowledge which He has given us of Himself in His Word forbids a literal interpretation, and requires us to understand it as a figurative mode of saying that He permitted His people to suffer for a season, but that in due time He delivered them. But here, too, great care is necessary to avoid the substitution of our own theories and preconceived opinions for the analogy of faith, which can be derived only from the Scriptures themselves, and to guard against false interpretations and the consequent adoption of a false system of doctrine, which could only lead to perversions of the Holy Spirit's words in order to bring them into harmony with what is the analogy of reason, not the analogy of faith. Error begets error. If these passages on which we must mainly depend for our light in regard to any article of faith are themselves figuratively interpreted, the result must needs be a false analogy which vitiates all subsequent exegesis.

A reason for departing from the literal sense exists, in the third place, when the context with its scope and circumstances plainly require it. Every part of the Holy Spirit's declarations are in harmony with every other part, and any seeming sense of particular words that is in conflict with the design and surroundings of the whole must evidently be a misapprehension. Therefore if the literal sense

of a passage is inconsistent with the manifest aim and purpose of the section in which it occurs, that fact is convincing proof that the words must be interpreted figuratively. In some instances the needed explanation is furnished expressly in the context, as when our Lord says in John 7, 38 that rivers of living water shall flow from within him who believes, and in the following verse it is said that He spake this of the Spirit which they that believe on Him should receive. The passage is thus shown to contain a metaphor, and the meaning obviously is that the believer shall not only have the gifts of the Spirit to refresh his own soul, but also to refresh others. But even when such direct indications are not given the context is a safe and sure guide in determining whether the words are to be understood literally or figuratively. When, e. g., in Isaiah 51, 1 the people of God are admonished to look unto the rock whence they were hewn and to the hole of the pit whence they were digged, the whole drift of the passage shows that the words are not meant literally, and the words of the following verse make clear the figurative meaning: "Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you." A careful study of the context and scope will in some cases demand a figurative interpretation in order to understand the parts in their relation to the whole, and when this is the case we have ample ground to be assured that the figurative is the sense intended by the Holy Spirit.

A reason for departing from the literal sense exists, finally, when the nature of the objects designated by the subject and predicate as joined in any given proposition demand a figurative interpretation. The Spirit of truth cannot without irreverence be presumed to contradict the truth on any subject, even though this should pertain to

other than spiritual matters. Hence when we once know the truth from parallel passages, or from the analogy of faith, or from the context and scope, the words whose literal meaning conflict with it are interpreted figuratively. But for the same reason when the predicate is not consistent with what is known of the things designated by the terms taken in their literal acceptation, this fact indicates that the words are used in a figurative sense. When, for instance, St. Paul refers to Christ as the foundation and speaks of building "upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble," (1 Cor. 3, 11–12), the nature of the foundation as known from Holy Scripture is such as to preclude the possibility of a literal acceptation of the words designating the materials built upon it. The context shows that the various doctrines are meant which men promulgate in connection with the fundamental truth concerning Christ. And again, when in the following verses he says that every man's work shall be tried by fire and some shall be burned, the nature of the subject is again such that literal fire and burning cannot be meant, but that the words must be used in a figurative sense. So when our Lord says, "Let the dead bury the dead," Matt. 8, 22, the impossibility that literally dead men should bury others is manifest, and the sense is obviously figurative, meaning that the burial of those who are bodily dead may be left to those who are spiritually dead, and must not be made an excuse for not following Jesus. But while it is maintained that our knowledge of the truth derived from other sources is good ground for departing from the literal sense of words in explaining Holy Scripture, and while it is conceded that there is truth derived from other sources than Holy Scripture which may furnish such a ground, all earnest Christians will see the

need of caution in this respect. Reason, which derives knowledge also from natural sources, is naturally blind and may mislead. It always transcends its bounds when it presumes to sit in judgment upon the truth given by inspiration of God, and sets up its natural knowledge as a criterion of supernatural things. Even in the sphere of nature our knowledge is very limited, and it is not modest and, in the strictest sense, not even rational to assert the extent of our knowledge as the limit of all possibility even in natural things. Much less could it be recognized as a legitimate exercise of human intelligence and thought to pronounce everything impossible that is not within the scope of our natural knowledge, and on the ground of a science falsely so called to reduce everything to figures that reason cannot comprehend and explain. Natural principles cannot be a criterion of supernatural truth, which lies on a higher plane. That which we know by reason can rightly be used as a test only in regard to things in the domain of nature. And the caution is all the more necessary because it is a natural result of man's innate blindness and sinful pride that his reason arrogates to itself powers which it does not possess and usurps authority and dominion where it can legitimately only serve. It is sad to hear men who profess to reverence the Word arguing that the body of the Lord cannot be present in the Holy Supper because as a corporeal thing we could see it if it were, or because, being a body, it could not be present in different places where the sacrament is celebrated at the same time; or that man's body cannot rise again on the last day, because it returns to dust and ceases to preserve its identity, and that passages alleging these things must therefore be interpreted as figures of speech. Let men beware of explaining away the precious

truth of God because it surpasses our natural understanding, and resolving it all into a figure.

But the sense may be expressed by a figurative use of words, and often is so expressed as well in the Holy Scriptures as elsewhere. It is only necessary in such cases to observe that the sense is not the same as the words would express if used literally, and that the figurative is the only sense of the words so used. The perceived resemblances between objects and actions, the associations formed in the mind, and the influence of imagination and feeling render it natural to employ tropes and figures, and the beauty which they add to the expression renders them desirable. But it is a mistake to maintain that they contribute to clearness. In the nature of the case that cannot be. The original and ordinary sense of words is always that which the mind first connects with them, and when there is a departure from this sense in their employment, there is always the additional labor imposed of resolving the figure before the sense becomes perfectly clear to thought, however strong the immediate impression may be on fancy and sensibility. Figures may illustrate when the truth is known, but they are not the proper vehicles to impart primary knowledge. No reasonable man thinks of drawing up a legal document or business letter in figurative language. Hence we cannot admit that a figure of speech could form a sufficient basis for an article of faith. In the absence of a plain statement in literal language there could be no assurance of faith. But when the subject-matter is once known, the truth can be figuratively expressed with effectiveness and force. When our Lord says "I am the door" John 10, 9, we must know from other texts who and what He is before the meaning can be distinctly apprehended. If we have not the materi-

als in mind to trace the resemblance between the person designated in the subject and the thing mentioned in the predicate, the statement will be meaningless, if not monstrous. The words have a meaning, and that meaning is clear to those who know what the Lord has done for His people and what He is to them. Evidently the words are not to be undestood literally. He is not such a door as men make of wood to their sheepfolds or houses. He is not a literal door through which literal sheep enter into their literal fold. But He *is* the door notwithstanding. He is the Savior of men, through whom alone they can enter into the kingdom of heaven. This is the sense of the words, and it is the only sense. What the Scriptures teach in numerous places without a figure enables us to understand the metophorical words, and to find the one sense which they were designed to convey. We cannot refrain, in passing, to express our astonishment at the thoughtlessness of men who will persist in explaining the words "This is my body" in the institution of the sacrament in the same metaphorical way. The door to the sheepfold is a symbol of the Savior through whom we have an entrance to heaven. The body is a symbol of what? The word bread is certainly not used metaphorically: it is literal bread and wine that is used in the holy sacrament. If the word body is used metaphorically, of what is it an emblem? The perpetration of such rhetorical nonsense on a subject so solemn and so sacred is wanton. We have no right to depart from the literal sense of divine words in any case, unless there is a plain indication given that God Himself desires His words to be understood figuratively; what shall we then say when attempts are made to foist in a figure where everything combines to forbid it?

The one sense which it is the interpreter's task to ascertain is contained in the words, whether these be used literally or figuratively. He must not put his judgments, fancies, or feelings into them, but derive from them the truth which the Holy Spirit has put into them. The sense must not be regarded as something separated from the words. These are designed to communicate it, and in them only is it to be sought and found. It is a fundamental error in hermeneutics to assume that the words are dead and must have life infused into them, that they are meaningless and must have sense communicated to them from the mind of the reader. Such an assumption, in pursuance of which the words of the Holy Spirit are irreverently spoken of and treated as dead letters, undermines all revealed truth and renders impossible that certainty which faith in such truth necessarily involves. The inspired words are living and give life. "The words that I speak unto you," says our Lord, "they are spirit and they are life." John 6, 63. "The Word of God is quick and powerful," says the Holy Spirit in Heb. 4, 12. The words have light and life in them, and bring all that is necessary to apprehend their blessed revelation. "If ye continue in my word," our Savior says, "then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth." John 8, 31, 32. It is true that certain conditions are to be fulfilled on our part in order to ascertain the sense, which is not so outwardly appended to the sounds and letters that every one who hears and sees necessarily apprehends it. We must of course learn the signification which usage has attached to these sounds and written or printed letters. All the helps at our command must be used to understand them in the connection of the words in sentences and paragraphs. But these are simply means of ascertaining what is in the

words, not of filling mere empty forms with a meaning which they do not contain. Whatever tends to put something into the words which is not there and was therefore not designed to be communicated by them, is not an exegetical help, but a means of wresting and perverting the Scriptures.

Strenuous efforts are made to justify much abuse in this regard by a misinterpretation and misapplication of the words of St. Paul, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." 2 Cor. 3, 6. It is a glaring instance of perversion leading to perversion, when this is explained as meaning that the words as they are heard as read are empty, lifeless and meaningless, and that the spiritual life of our own souls must breathe life into them and fill their empty forms with meaning, and when, on this assumption, interpreters proceed to foist into the divine words their own human opinions. There is not in the passage a shadow of ground for such an interpretation, and the rule by which the abuse is attempted to be justified is itself obtained only by means of the abuse which it seeks to justify. For, in the first place, the words do not say that the letter is dead. On the contrary it predicates that of it which would be impossible if it were a dead and powerless thing. "The letter killeth." It is not dead, but active and full of deadly power; it kills. And, in the second place, this is not said of the entire Word of God, but only of that portion which reveals sin and condemns the sinner. The apostle is speaking of the glory of the Gospel ministry. God "hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." That the letter which killeth is the Law that condemns the sinner to death, as distinguished from the Gospel which gives him pardon and

life, is indisputably manifest from the next verses, where the apostle says: "If the ministration of death, written and engraved in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away, how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." The law condemns and kills, the Gospel absolves and quickens. In neither case is the word a dead letter. In both cases the sense is in the words, and must be drawn only from the words. In every case the interpreter is bound to show what the Holy Spirit has put into the words, not to graft his own opinions upon them.

This rule has been much sinned against. Not only have unbelieving men endeavored to palm off their weak cogitations for the thoughts of God by tying them to the sacred text, but even confessors of Christianity have been guilty and are still guilty of the same perilous proceeding, though in some instances it be without any design to renounce the Word of their Lord. Principles are often accepted which must lead to such abuse, and those who inculcate them have means of knowing the inevitable consequence. When Romanists, e. g., advocate the doctrine that the declarations of the Roman bishop are infallible, they are bound to find them in accord with the Bible words, whatever these may say, and that which the alleged unerring authority has declared must be put into them. When Reformed parties maintain that a passage cannot be accepted in any sense that is not in harmony with the dictates of reason, there is no way open in the numerous cases in which the inspired words communicate truths of which reason can

be no judge, because they lie entirely above its domain, but that of putting into them what they do not say. And when fanatics of every hue appeal to their own hearts as furnishing the spiritual truth which gives life and meaning to all the words of the Bible, the gates are opened for every heresy to which the sinful heart gives birth, and all exegetical certainty and all hope of unity is at an end. Let men beware of such wiles of the devil. The sense of the Holy Spirit is in the words, and that sense is always but one, whether these words be used in their literal or in a figurative acceptation.

We have thus far spoken of the sense of the words, or the verbal sense. But there is also a mystical sense which demands our attention. Of this we shall speak in a subsequent article. L.

THE VII. ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

(THIRD AND LAST PAPER.)

Ad. b.) "*Nor is it necessary that human traditions, or rites and ceremonies instituted by men, be alike everywhere. As Paul says: One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, cet.*" It is here assumed that there is to the Church of Christ, as constituted on earth, a human side as well as a divine: that the spiritual organism, or the Church proper, takes shape in the form of earthly institutions and avails itself of human contrivances in order to work out its mission among men. The important truth underlying this part of the proposition and which is silently recognized, is, that the kingdom of Christ is above all, is the end of all existence,

and that for this reason everything should be sanctified and placed into its service. At the same time it is careful to distinguish between the Church as a divine creation on the one hand, and the Church as humanly ordered on the other; as also between the things of God's appointment and the things devised by men. Essential to the Church is what God Himself has ordained and points out in the Bible; and within the sphere of His ordinances, men have no privileges except those of willing obedience and of grateful use. But in what lies beyond this sphere, God has left many things to the judgment and will of His people.

As has been shown in a former article, there is a necessity of the human and earthly side to the Church's present existence; and hence corresponding to that side there is a necessity also of human and earthly things in the Church. True, this is not an absolute but a relative necessity, yet a necessity all the same. That such is the case, is the assumption on which the Confession proceeds; and that the necessity is a subordinate and relative one, is plainly involved in its declaration that uniformity in the things instituted by men is not necessary to the true unity of the Church.

"To the true"—that is, to the inner, spiritual and essential—"unity of the Church," that is, of the Church as the body of Christ, it is not necessary that there be sameness in the things under consideration. Nevertheless, to the Church external, in the form and order of which the Church internal would build itself up, these things are of great value and some of them indispensable; and this the Article does not wish to deny. When, therefore, it would insist that uniformity in such matters is not necessary to the Church in its true and spiritual conception, it does not

intend to have the importance of the things themselves underrated. Its object is to call attention to their real character, to-wit, that they are earthly and human things and as such cannot be classed with things divine; and thus it aims to have assigned to them their proper place, and to point out their real value and their right use.

When the Confession expressly mentions traditions, rites and ceremonies, it does so no doubt simply to exemplify the character of the things it has in view, and not to summarize and, least of all, to classify them. This is evident from the fact that while the Latin text speaks of traditions, rites and ceremonies, the German makes mention of the last named only. What is meant to be covered here is everything human and earthly that properly enters into churchdom as distinguished from the Church, and that may be said to come up under the general head of the Church's cultus and of its polity. It therefore includes such things as the order of worship; churchly practices; the arts of oratory, of music, of painting, carving, sculpture, paramentic; the use of vessels and vestments, in short, everything auxiliary to the work of the Church and in keeping with its character. Moreover, the particular structure of its external organization and of its mode of government belong here, as do also its Confessions so far as these come into consideration merely as forms of the faith. The field intended to be covered is therefore a very wide one, and at the same time one of no little importance.

What the Confession says concerning such things is that they need not be alike everywhere. The reason for the judgment thus pronounced lies in the human origin and nature of the things referred to. Traditions, rites and ceremonies, the Article would say, are not necessarily the same

everywhere, when and because they are human, when and because they are instituted by men. Whatever is of men lacks both the authority of God's Law and the saving efficacy of His Gospel; and therefore it can be neither binding on the consciences of men nor possess a power saving to their souls. This is the major premise on which the Article's statement is built up. "For the righteousness that availeth before God and which comes through faith, is not contingent on external ceremonies and human traditions"—says the Apology in its elucidation of this Article. "For"—it continues to say—"faith is a light in the heart and one that renews and quickens the heart, and to accomplish this, external traditions and ceremonies, be they universal or particular, are of little use. And it was not without good cause that we have put forth this Article"—i. e. the seventh of the Augsburg Confession—"for in consequence of traditions many grievous errors and foolish opinions have crept into the Church. Some have held that Christian holiness and faith would avail nothing before God without the observance of such human traditions and that it was impossible to be a Christian unless they were regarded, when in point of fact they are nothing more than external ordinances such as at times happen to be, with or without cause, different in one locality from what they are in another, just as in the matter of municipal government one city follows practices varying from those of other cities. History moreover tells us that one church was excommunicated by another because of a difference between them with regard to the day on which to observe Easter and whether pictures and similar things might be tolerated in the church. By such rulings the untutored were led to think it impossible for one to become just before God without the observance of ceremonies. . . ." Mueller, p. 159.

To an evangelical Christian it is plain that the error against which the Confession here inveighs, is one that subverts the entire Word of God: not only that the Law and the Gospel were woefully mixed up, but the commandments of men and the doctrines of devils were given out for the words of God; and it was held that in the keeping of them men did God service and saved their own souls! To understand how such damnable heresies could gain a foothold in the Church and maintain themselves for so long a time, yes, and up to this day, it is only necessary to recall to mind that the Romish church co-ordinates tradition and the Scriptures, that it teaches righteousness in part by works, that it believes the so-called universal ceremonies to be divinely ordained, insists that the means of grace, after having multiplied them at will, are efficacious *ex opere operato*, and lastly, that it looks upon its priesthood as one clothed of God with authority over the bodies and souls of men.

In their answer to that part of the seventh Article which says that traditions, rites and ceremonies need not be alike everywhere, the papists set up the claim that such could not be said of what they termed *traditiones universales;* and in support of their claim they endeavored to maintain that such traditions were of Apostolic institution, and if such, then divine and hence obligatory. They pointed out the Apostolic *example*, declared this to be authoritative, and that too in the face of Apostolic *precept* which plainly forbade them to do so. And hence the Apology justly remarks: "The adversaries say that traditions, especially the universal, are to be observed because it is to be presumed that they have been transmitted to us from the Apostles. O how great, holy, noble and apostolic these people are.

How very pious and spiritual they have become all at once! The traditions and ceremonies, instituted, as they say, by the Apostles, they will observe; but the Apostles' doctrine and clear word they will not heed. But we say and know it to be right: we are not to teach, judge and speak of traditions otherwise than did the Apostles themselves in their writings. The Apostles, however, everywhere most severely and vehemently contend, not only against those who would exalt human traditions, but also and especially against those who deem the Law of God and the ceremonies of circumcision, etc., to be necessary to salvation. In no way did the Apostles desire the consciences of men to be burdened by the opinion that the non-observance of such traditions as pertain to certain days, fasts, meats, and the like, were a sin. More than that: Paul expressly declares such opinions to be doctrines of devils. (1 Tim. 4, 1.) It follows that in order to ascertain what the Apostles judged to be good and right in such matters, not their example only but their writings must be consulted." Mueller, p. p. 160–161.

The three cardinal doctrines mainly at stake in this controversy are those of the means of grace, of justification by grace and through faith alone, and lastly that of the Christian's liberty in spiritual things over against all mere human authority. These doctrines as they are held by the Lutheran Church, constitute the basis on which the seventh Article makes its pronouncement with reference to human traditions, and all the rites and ceremonies instituted by men and in vogue within the Church. The statement it makes is simply thetical; the argument and proof are found in the Articles accompanying it and in its Apology.

The introduction into the Church and observance of certain practices, customs, etc., by men is by the Scriptures

neither commanded nor forbidden; the same may be said of the enactment of and obedience to certain rules and regulations for the purpose of establishing and preserving good order and discipline in the external affairs of the Church. As has been shown, to do so is necessary and profitable; and that the churches have a right to do such things, is a legitimate inference from the precedent to it furnished by the Scriptures. The chief thing is that the correct Scriptural view and their right use be maintained, then too, that they do not hinder, but rather further the Word of God in its course among men. Concerning everything entering into the cultus of the Church it must be required that it be strictly appropriate; and whatever belongs to the Church's polity must be such as to serve the end in view. Of the former it is written: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." Phil. 4, 8. And concerning the latter: "Let all things be done decently and in order." 1 Cor. 14, 40. "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints." Ib. v. 33. (See the entire chapter from v. 23 on.)

Beyond these general principles to guide Christians in ordering their worship and in governing the temporal affairs of the Church, no word of command is given them of God: to determine the specific rites, practices, customs, forms, orders, etc., that He has committed to the enlightened judgment and the good pleasure of His people; but this with the distinct charge that in the exercise of the liberty thus bestowed, no one judge his brother's conscience,

or strive after lordship over him whom God has made free. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath day: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ. Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshiping of angels. . . . Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (Touch not; taste not; handle not; which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things indeed have a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility and neglecting of the body; but not in any honor to the satifying of the flesh"—(rather, *against* the indulgence of the flesh.) Col. 2, 18–23.

The things devised by men, even by Christian men, and by them consecrated to the service of God, are and ever remain human in their origin and nature, and as such they belong to the category of *adiaphoræ*—of things which men may use or not use as, under the circumstances of time and place, it may seem best to them. The things that come to the Church from God are the spiritual, the saving, the eternal, the immutable and therefore the essential to the Church and its unity; to this the Article refers and this it would declare where it points to Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.

On the other hand, such things as come to the Church from men are earthly, temporal, changeable and more or less dispensable; and therefore, as the Confession says, it is not necessary that they be alike everywhere, implying that the Church is free to determine their number and kind, something that could never be said if these things were in themselves something divinely obligatory or efficacious.

From this it by no means follows that the things in question are insignificant and useless, so that the Church might just as well do without them altogether. The rule holds here as elsewhere, to wit, that what in the abstract is an adiaphoron, in the concrete may cease to be such. For example, to uncover and bow one's head in prayer is expressive of reverence and humility. Now it is possible that the substance is there without the expression, or again, that the expression is there without the substance; in so far is the uncovering and bowing of the head an adiaphoron; but it ceases to be such just as soon as the individual is invited by the circumstances of time and place in that way to express his reverence to and his humility before God. If then without good reason he objects to the custom and refuses to observe it, he offends both God and men.

This one example and a little reflection on it may serve to show that if the ceremonies and ordinances of the Church are the genuine product of its own pure life, there is in them all an element of confession: as they spring from and are consecrated by the life that is of God, so do they point back and up to God and do Him honor. Moreover, because confessional, they have at the same time also a didactic and disciplinary value in respect to men. By their observance the Gospel facts of which they are emblematic, or the Gospel truths which they represent, or the Gospel life they give expression to -either one or all of them, as the case may be—are brought to the memory of such as know their meaning. And hence the worth of traditions, rites, ceremonies, ordinances, etc., in vogue within the Church and in keeping with its character. There is a profit as well as a propriety and beauty in observing them. On the other hand, whenever their disregard implies a denial of God's truth, or

an unnecessary offence to some soul, then is their non-observance a sin. "We believe, teach and confess"—says the Formula of Concord—"that in the time of persecution, when an unequivocal confession of faith is required of us, we are not to yield to the enemies even in such adiaphorae, as the Apostle writes: 'Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage' (Gal. 5, 1.). And again: 'Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness' (2 Cor. 6, 14.). And lastly: 'To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you'." (Gal. 2, 5.). *Mueller*, p. 552.

This last passage especially furnishes a case in point. With the coming in of the New Covenant, the Old, with its shadows and types and sacraments, and institutions generally, had served its purpose and came to an end. Baptism had been put in the place of circumcision, so that the latter was no longer obligatory, or necessary to salvation. Still, if for some social or national reason people thought it desirable to be circumcised, their wish could be gratified; there was no command forbidding this. Hence we read that Paul, while he would not agree to the circumcision of Titus, himself took Timothy to circumcise him. Acts, 16. The reason is obvious: "false brethren," as he calls them, insisted on the circumcision of Titus as necessary to his salvation; he opposed them in order that he might in no way abet a heresy that he knew to be subversive of the Gospel of Christ. Timothy he circumcised from motives of expediency, for he judged that being a Greek, Timothy would be more acceptable to the Jews, among whom he was to labor, if he were first

circumcised. With this action of St. Paul, compare the discussion and decision on this same subject recorded in the 15th chapter of the Acts, as also 1 Cor. 7, 18.

The judgment of the Apostle in this particular case is exceedingly instructive and of great value. Christians nowadays often find themselves put in a similar strait, and here they may learn what to do under such circumstances. For example, every intelligent believer knows that the cross and the crucifix, more than anything else, are the appropriate symbols of Christianity; but there are simple minded Christians who do not so view them; on the contrary, they look upon them as symbols of Roman Catholicism. What is to be done when people of this class are found in the congregation? It would certainly be unwise and contrary to the law of love in that case to introduce into the church the cross or the crucifix; for the power the Lord has given to His people is unto edification and not unto destruction. Instruction from the Word, and if necessary long and continued instruction, is in place where obstacles of that kind present themselves, and not until the prejudices have been removed or have turned into obduracy has the time come to set up the symbols of man's sweetest consolation and highest hopes. To the enemies of what the cross and the crucifix symbolize, Christians dare "give place in subjection, no, not for an hour."

And it is always worth the labor and pain it entails to contend for the true doctrine concerning churchly rites and ordinances, and for these themselves, provided they are really of a churchly character. The doctrine concerning them is too closely connected with the cardinal doctrines of salvation to be passed by; and as to the things themselves, they are too valuable to forego their use entirely. It is by no

means a matter of indifference how the temple of God is constructed and ornamented, how His worship is conducted, or how His people govern themselves in the work of the Church. What must be required in all cases is propriety and suitableness, and above all, that nothing militate against the divine Word or bring injury to the soul. Positively, everything must be such as to assist in some way the coming of God's kingdom among men.

Moreover, the words of the Seventh Article, "nor is it necessary—" are not to be read, "nor is it desirable—." On this point the Apology says: "It pleases us too, for the sake of unity and good order, to have the more common ceremonies observed alike everywhere—even as is done among us as regards the mass, the Lord's day, and others of the chief festivals. We take pleasure in all good and useful human traditions, especially in such as serve to produce a good external discipline among the young and among the people generally." Mueller, p. 159. It should not be, but it is the case nowadays that some people, when removing to other localities, take offence because in their new church-home they do not find things just as they were in the old, and to which they had become fondly attached. "The doctrine," they admit, "is the same; but the ways," they say, "are so different." That they prefer the ways they have been used to to such as seem strange to them, for that no reasonable person will blame them; they have a full right to their tastes and preferences; but to take serious offence at things purely ritual and ceremonial, and to make of them a stumbling block to one's faith, is quite a different matter. It evinces an ignorance if not a prejudice, such as Christians, especially Lutheran Christians, should not be guilty of. Howbeit, such cases are not unfrequent, even among the latter; and this

goes to show that more attention should be given to the subject than it seems to receive.

Because the Lutheran Church has from its beginning recognized the adiaphorous character of all such things as are devised by men and properly enter into the cultus and polity of the Church, and thus assigned them with the necessary restrictions to the sphere of Christian liberty, the consequence has been that in the course of time the Lutheran Church has displayed a wonderful productiveness, adaptability and diversity in everything external to the Church. Lutherans have felt themselves free to follow their own taste in architecture and in the decorative arts; and to this day they may be found worshiping be it in buildings Quakerly plain and Calvinistically bare, or be it in temples that compare well with the finest cathedrals in Christendom. The same diversity is again found among them in the manner their worship is conducted in: while some may be said to have no fixed forms at all, others follow a liturgy as rich as that of the church of Rome, and one that is much more complete. So, too, some use the robe and bands, others do without them, just as it seems best to the people whom the pastor is called to serve. As to forms of government, there is not one that the Scriptures allow and is in vogue among the Church, but what Lutherans can adapt themselves to it; and though its preference is for the congregational, yet are the representative and the episcopal in use throughout many parts of it. Its principles all tend towards an entire independency from the State; but when the force of events have drawn it into alliance with the governments of this earth, the Lutheran Church has time and again proved itself equal to meet the dangers always attending these incongruous combinations.

Amidst all the things entering into the external organization of the Church, its government and its operations, and the many complications apt to arise from them, how important it is to preserve intact the distinction between that which is of God and godly and that which is of men and human! To do this very thing Lutherans have laid for themselves an excellent foundation in the seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession. C. H. L. S.

THE POSITION AND TASK OF THE EV. LUTH. CHURCH WITH REGARD TO THE ADVANCES OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH OF THE PRESENT.

An Address Delivered by Dr. Luthardt at the meeting of the General Lutheran Conference held at Hamburg Oct. 12th, 1887, and translated by Rev. J. H. Schneider of Circleville, O.

The theme to which I would introduce you is: The position, etc.

This theme has not been arbitrarily chosen, nor is it a challenge. A challenge has been cast before our feet, or rather has been thrust upon our consciences. Without a gross neglect of duty, we cannot let a General Lutheran Conference pass by without discussing the above theme.

No one will dare to say that we stir up strife where there is peace. It would certainly provoke an involuntary smile on our part, should Romanists speak to us of peace. Moreover, the theme has no polemic sound, nor is it meant for a war-cry against any one. It is only a word of warning for ourselves, and a reminder of our task with regard to the Romanists. In speaking of these things, we cannot prevent the points of difference, separating us from the church of

the pope, from coming plainly before us. Some sharp words may also fall. We shall, however, not forget that, God be praised, we have an inheritance in common with them, and that our earliest history reaches back through the centuries before the Reformation, back to the days of the Apostles. Nevertheless we dare not keep it hid from them that our church has in her favor the testimony of those centuries, that she is the legitimate daughter of the apostolic church, while in the Romish Church, the inheritance of the truth as held by the primitive Christian Church, has been covered over and made more or less ineffective by the foreign additions accumulating in course of time about the apostles' teachings. We can, therefore, also not fobear telling them that we shall not look on with indifference when this corruption of truths is offered for sale to our people as that truth which is necessary to our salvation.

We are well aware of the responsibility assumed over against our nation by church polemics.

Nothing is farther from us than to sow division into the Church. We have learned to endure by sad experience; for the wounds, which the saddest of all wars inflicted upon our land in the seventeenth century, are not yet fully healed. Woe to the hand which would again arouse the old spirit of ecclesiastical fanaticism. But we believe that we dare say that fanaticism is not an attribute of the Evangelical party. If it should here and there venture to show itself among us, we would be the first to condemn it. It is, however, shall I say the fate or calling, of this nation, that, especially within its bounds, these points of difference between Rome and the Gospel are to be settled, or at least discussed, and we have to bear the burden of this calling. Why has this lot befallen us? Why did things not go on as they promised,

when, perhaps, nine-tenths of our nation had embraced the Gospel? We cannot tell. No doubt it is our own fault. We must humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God. Our land has well been called the heart of Europe. But the heart is the place where the fiercest battles are fought and the dearest victories are won. Thus also this deep-going and most painful of all differences within the Christian Church must pierce the heart of our people. The other nations of Europe experience less of religious controversy, least of all the Romanic nations. Our nation has always been serious on religious questions. Therefore this difference is always painfully felt. It is all the more necessary to remember that the armor to be used in this battle dare not be carnal but must be spiritual, not the compulsion and force or the exciting of sinful passions, but the Word of God and the zeal of faith. Our people, even those also who are in the Romish Church, are not averse to this. We are convinced that if we had no other opponents than those of our countrymen in that church, and these left free to act as prompted by their piety, we could readily agree. It is the alien spirit which has gained power over them and threatens to poison their very blood. Here is the danger. We are not apt to deceive ourselves when we express the fear that the opposition will become more marked. The more Rome is consistent with itself and gains its ends the greater will its opposition to the Gospel appear, and the more inimical will be its position towards us. This will be the case whether we desire it or not. Many a voice brings to our ears that well known "non licet esse vos." In the eyes of Rome we have no right to exist. How we would fare, if Rome would gain the power and could do as it desires, is no secret to us. Rome has told us often and plainly

enough. The Syllabus (in No. 24) rejects the error, "That the pope has not the right to employ forcible means." Amongst the expressions made at the last council regarding the church, the twelfth canon anathematizes every one who denies that the church receives power from the Lord and Savior to correct and compel the erring and stiff-necked by means of external sentence and wholesome punishment. We know quite well from history what is meant by "wholesome punishment." Romish "conversions" of former centuries tell us. Look, for example, to Austria and to France. Lest we might still be in doubt, some American bishops, in public declarations, and even the official Journal of Rome, the "*Civilta Catholica*," have boldly stated that by wholesome punishment are meant also imprisonment, fines and lashes. How far some individuals among them are carried by their fancies can be seen from the expression of the Romish Controversalist Windeck. He says: "Oportet Lutheranos et omnes alios haereticos mortis supplicio exterminandos, interficiendos, propellendos, reprimendos, delendos, ustionibus, exscindendos, tollendos, explodendos, viriliter exstirpendos, trucidandos, internecione delendos." Here some in the audience called out, "Give that in German." The author replied: "Such things should not at all be said in German. The sense, in brief, is, that we should be made shorter by a head," i. e., our heads are at stake (see also Ballarmin (Jesuit) who died in 1621, and who, in his *Disputatio de controversiis*, 1596, TI. p. 1823, says: *Haeretici excommunicari jure possunt*, ut omnes *fatentur*, *ergo et occidi.* And John de Alloza (Jesuit), who died in 1666, Flores summarum 1667, p. 473: *haeretici impoenitentes morti puniuntur.* If we understand the Bible, this method of "converting" and "saving" souls is not in consonance with the course

pursued by our Lord and Savior, when He invited the weary and heavy-laden to come to Him. That those threats are meant for us too, is also beyond a doubt, since we, according to Romish teaching, are, through baptism, made members of the Romish church and subject to the pope, and are thus by virtue of right under his jurisdiction. For instance, the "Brief of Pius VII," 1803, says: "According to Scriptures, Councils, and Traditions, the heretics always remain subject to the laws of the Catholic Church."

After these introductory remarks, I would, in the first place, direct attention to the fact that the relation existing at present between the Romish church and ourselves is essentially different from what it was during the first decades of this century. I am well aware that, since the council of Trent, the Romish Church has remained essentially the same. Before that time the Western Church still bore the Gospel within herself, having as it were, two nations in her womb. But when since then Rome condemned the testimony of the Reformation, it thereby cast out Him who was love according to the Spirit; it entrenched itself against the Gospel, and delivered itself into the hands of Jesuitism. Jesuistism made the cause of Rome its own, but, by the very act, it gained power over Rome. It became Rome's fatality; and it now drives Rome from one consequence to another. The dogma of Vaticanism was already set forth by the Jesuits in their theology and also by Lainez at Trent. Our great dogmatician, John Gerhard, in his "*Confessio Catholica*," declares plainly that this is the principle of the Romish Church and its theology. In the history of the Anti-Reformation, this was translated into bloody and tearful reality. But after the Spirit of "enlightenment" had done its devastating work, as well in the

Romish Church as of our own also, after the precious seed, sown and watered by the lone witnesses in those days of "enlightenment" had sprung up in the severe school into which the Lord led our people in the beginning of this century, and, last but not least, after the breath of a new, warm life had been infused from the heart of the Evangelical party into the midst of the Romanists, it appeared indeed as though the old spirit of quarrelling should be subdued, (though not in external oneness, for that was impossible,) by a spirit of mutual recognition and peaceable intercourse. We have all heard of those spring-days of new Christian life in both Churches. The kingdom of God formed the topic of interest, whether this was in the Cathedrals, or in Frankfort, or in South Germany. The newly awakened children of God in one land sought those of other lands and joyously shook hands across the walls of churchly division. They greeted each other in one name, and that the name of Jesus. It was at that time that bishop Sailer said to Tholuck, who had just returned from Rome, where he had been in the capacity of pastor to the minister at Rome, that he rejoiced to see Christian love show itself in this, that the pope permitted the Protestants to have preaching at the very seat of the holy father. Wittmann, who was subsequently bishop of Ratisbon, committed this intelligence to his students, saying: "Just think, the pope permits the Gospel to be preached at Rome." It is true, the judgments of the "holy father," even of Leo XIII, with regard to Protestant services and schools at Rome, differ from this. We can account for the difference, if we hear, as I heard, Tholuck tell that Sailer took down from his library a Bible commentary. Here the words of the Lord: "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much," were explained as mean-

ing: "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven her, *therefore* she loves much." Having read this explanation, Sailer said: "He has hit the point, thus it is." Then it was possible to hear, as I did, a Romish priest speak words of praise at the grave of a Protestant pastor. It could also occur, as I witnessed, somewhere in the 4th decade, that a number of Tyrolian priests and professors, belonging to the order of Benedicts, were greatly filled with joy at hearing that Hengstenberg was passing through the place. They had me go and ask Hengstenberg to come and spend the day with them. They assured me that they would gladly make room in their crowded quarters. When I had to inform them that, owing to his traveling in company, Hengstenberg could not comply with their wish, they were very sad, and stood watching the boat in which the noted man was borne away, as long as they could see it. This sounds to us like the fairy tales of long ago. One of those Benedicts, the excellent Felix of Innspruck, called us aside one day after dinner, and asked us whether he did not look like Luther. When we told him that his face and form reminded one of Luther and that he had something popular in his whole bearing, he was pleased and seemed greatly flattered. In later days he went to Rome and was there made more Romish, though he always retained his honest German mind, even when he was made papal house prelate and auditor of Rota Romana. This, and all that was like it, has long since passed away. Only here and there, perhaps in some secluded spot, we meet with weak reminders of it.

We readily admit that things could not remain as they were when those first beginnings of life manifested themselves. We claim that it was right and necessary that the time of youthful enthusiasm should give way to a mature churchly manhood and decision.

But while, in our Church, this development led to a firmer and more comprehensive grasping of the saving truth as it is contained in our Confessions, it was the fate of Rome to place its churchly life in the care of an external, fanatical cultus, in the unconditional return to scholastic theology, and in the development of ecclesiastical absolutism. The power which accomplished this is the order of Jesuits in the Romish Church. It was significant that the papacy after it had returned out of its Napoleanic banishment, chiefly through the aid of a heretical and schismatical prince, should mark this new beginning by reinstating the order of the Jesuits. It is the more significant, if we keep in mind that on the 16th of August, 1773, the *infallible* Clemens XIV. (Gauganelli) had issued the bull "*Dominus ac redemptor noster*," in which he declares it necessary to the peace of the Church that the order of the Jesuits be forever abolished. From that time dates the vehement, unabating and successful opposition against the irenic and more or less evangelical course of thinking and acting in the Romish Church. The Romish Church of to-day is more than ever dominated over by that anti-evangelical spirit. The "Peace pope," as some are fond of calling the politician Leo XIII., in his Brief of July 13th, 1886, pays the highest tribute to the activity of the Jesuits, and confirmed anew all their privileges. When at the close of the third decade of this century, a lively opposition arose against the proposed introduction of the Jesuits into Bavaria, the notorious "*Historisch-politische Blaetter*" said: "None but silly persons are afraid of the Jesuits." It was then that Harlez, 1839, published his "*Jesuiten-Spiegel*" in order to show that there is indeed reason to fear the moral and religious evils which follow in the wake of that order.

It is the spirit of Jesuitism that reduces Christianity to that formalism, against which not only Amalia of Lasaulx has cause to raise a lay of bitter complaint, but it is that which characterizes modern Romanism and threatens to drag Christianity in that Church down to a level with Paganism. We see an example of this in Italy.* We see how it more and more threatens to destroy the religious life of our German Catholic people.

While formerly pious Christians of both churches met and greeted each other in the name at which alone all knees shall bow, in the name of Him who is the only Mediator between God and man, we find that in our day, at the opening of the Vatican Council, there was no hesitancy to preach of the incarnation of God in the pope. Those pilgrims from Einsiedeln, in their address, honored Pius IX. with the words addressed by Peter to the Lord Jesus: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." Jno. 6, 68. This use of these words was justified by Philippi in his "Kirchenrecht," II., 1, page 323. It is true that in earlier times incredible things were perpetrated to glorify the pope. There was no hesitancy to call the pope not only "*monarcha orbis*," ruler of the world,† but also "*dominus ac*

* The philosopher Augustus Vera, who died at Naples, 1885, says: "Italian Catholicism is the nearest approach to heathendom, and in this sense we can well say that it is the "*irreligion*" in the Christian religion. It may seem strange that Italy, the seat of popery, is in a certain respect also the seat of irreligion. Nevertheless it is the truth. The Italian's relation to religion is a thoughtless one. Either he will mock at religion, or he will blindly and passively subject himself to the Church. The restless nature of the Frenchman vacillates between Catholicism and revolution." — Published in "*Zeitschrift fuer allgemeine Geschichte*. No. VIII, 1887.

† Gessler "Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte," II., 4, 223.

deus noster."* This was done at the very time that Petrarch could find no adequate words to depict the corruption of the papal court of Avignon.† At the Lateran Council, immediately preceding the Reformation, the warlike, but utterly unspiritual Julius II. was addressed as "*alter deus in terris,*" ‡ that is, as other God on earth. The man of aesthetie enjoyments, Leo X., as also now again, Leo XIII., was greeted as the "lion from the tribe of Juda," and words which speak of God or of Christ were applied to him.§ But no matter what the past has done in this direction, the present is seeking to emulate it. I hold in my hand a photograph, such as the clergy in France has distributed by the thousands. Among us it seems this thing has not yet been attempted. The picture represented the ship of the church. The vessel was manned with French sailors who were climbing among the rigging. Christ Himself lay sleeping in the rear part of the ship, while the pope, wearing his crown and spreading out his hands to quell the commotion of the sea, sat in the fore part. Christ may be at ease. His vicegerent has relieved Him of the care for the church.|| This is the

* Gessler in the above work, II., 3, page 98.

† Compare Gessler in the above work, page 110.

‡ Extracts from an address delivered by Christoph Marcellus, at the 4th session of the Lateran Council, Dec. 10, 1512.

§ During the 6th session of the Lateran Council, 1516, Leo X. was called "*Leo de tribu Juda et radix David.*" During the 9th session Antonius Puccius addressed the pope in the language of the 72d psalm: "*Omnes reges terrae adorabunt te et tibi servient.*" During the 1st session the address was used: "*vestra divina majestas,*" and in the 9th session: "*simillimus deo et qui a populis adorari debet.*"

|| "Janus," page 42, says: "God has gone to sleep, for in His stead rules His ever-wakeful and unerring vicar on earth, exercising the office of Ruler of the world as the dispensor of grace and punishment."—Compare also my "Apologetishe Vortraege, etc.," 5th ed., 7th lecture, 21st note, page 306.

spiritual bread with which those people are fed and which is intended for our people just as well.

While formerly the believers among us met in their common love to their Lord and Redeemer, this is no more the case. At present the thoughts of the other party are engaged with various appearances of the Madonna, as she is claimed to have revealed herself to children; or with the wonder-working water of Lourdes, sent out in any desired quantity; or with some other things which we are constrained to call childish. Perhaps a thought may also be given to theological questions like these: "In how far did the Virgin Mary cooperate in the work of redemption? In how far is she received in the Lord's Supper?" In a fast-mandate, issued by the bishops of Farrara, these words occur: "When both Christ and Mary had died, one could be in doubt whether the God-man did more to redeem the world with His blood than Mary with her tears." The Jesuit Fabius Ambrosius Spinola writes, in his "Festival or Festbuechlein," published in German by Sigismund Lauser, also a Jesuit, page 263: "There is none, O blessed Virgin, saved without thee, O thou purest one; there is none who enjoys a favor except through thee, O thou most beloved. She knows all that has been or shall be, besides those things which pertain peculiarly to Christ."* Again he says, page 325: "Also in the name of Mary the knees of all those who are in heaven and on earth and in hell are bowed."

What, according to this, is there lacking to make Mary divine? In essence things stand thus to-day. The adorer of Mary, Pius IX., declares in his encyclical letter of February 2d, 1849: "All ground of our confidence rests

* Uhlhorn, "Das roemische Concil." Hannover, 1870, page 86.

upon the most holy Virgin, since God deposited in Mary the fulness of all that is good. Whatsoever there is in us of hope, what of grace, what of salvation streams upon us from her, because this is the will of Him who desires that we should have everything through Mary."

We know, however, from Scriptures that "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," than the name of Jesus Christ. But I must cease multiplying such extravaganzas, which, if she knew of them, would certainly prove an abomination to the blessed and meek Virgin. From what has been said, we can learn to understand why Pusey, returning to England from a journey through France, summed up his impressions in these words: "I have seen that the Church of England is a Church of Jesus Christ, the Church of France is a Church of Mary. Nor, I must confess, did I receive a different impression of southern France. New and more sensual observance, growing on the ground of an enthusiastic fancy, are continually introduced. Luther, indeed, won his firmness of faith by making conscience the battle field and by building upon the Gospel, Loyola, on the contrary, sought his on the field of fancy and built it on the ground of fanaticism. This rich ground constantly produces new growths."

This is one of the fruits of the new spirit. Another is the unconditional return to scholastic theology. It is a characteristic especially to the Romish school to hide itself in the world of the scholastic school, and to look upon the very doubtful grade of knowledge then prevalent as the light of perfection. It seemed, it is true, at the beginning of the newer Catholic theology, as though a time of theological understanding and communication were at hand.

Much as we have to say against *Moehler's Symbolik*, we have, nevertheless, been constrained to admire the noble spirit of this theologian, as well as the earnestness of his work. Many another name could be added to his. The pillars of the Romish school, such as Perrone and his like, have no understanding and no appreciation whatever of Evangelical theological labors. Theirs is that zealotical scholasticism as the distinguished Felix called it and which he described in his letters from Rome, although he was faithful to his church, and enjoyed the favor of Pius IX and of Cardinal Riesach and occupied prominent positions in the church. He wrote that at Rome he first learned really to appreciate German learning, though the Italians might excel in casnistic aptness. "To this, however," he continues, "they add an immense pride. They consider themselves as knowing things perfectly." He considered the Jesuitic system dangerous. He feared bad results from the exclusive rule of scholasticism. The exalted heads, especially in Westphalia and the Rhine countries, caused him great concern. His German spirit was aroused by the intrigues of the foreigners. He considered it unconditionally necessary that the German element should be encouraged and strengthened. He says, referring to the spiritual Rome: "The more I learn to know Rome, the more misanthropically I withdraw from the world around." "Rome must receive strength from Germany," he exclaims. This has not come to pass, nor will it come to pass. Instead of the Romish Church being Germanized, the German Catholic Church has been Romanized, and is being carried farther in this direction day by day. This widens the gulf between them and ourselves.

This romanizing lies in the very nature of the thing.

Popery has from time to time come to be more and more an Italian Institution.* Since the attempt at reformation, undertaken by Hadrian VI, was ended so suddenly by his death, no other German pope has ascended the papal seat. It seems as though the Germans are not fully trusted. This German spirit and conscience might possibly run away with Romish policy. Things are safer with the Italiens. In drawing the consequences of formal logic, without heeding the objections of the emotions, the Roman mind, as it seems, excels the German. The Romish system is a system of purely juristic logic. According to this logic, the absolutism of the papal power, and the infalibility of the chief teacher and ruler of the church are the most natural consequence of the exclusiveness and infallibility of the external church and its office of teaching. The Vatican did nothing more than dot the I, when it raised this logical deduction to the position of a dogma. In this correct logical deduction is found the strength of the papal power among the bishops, and the weakness of the German opposition. An eye-witness, a former Benedictine friar of the Boniface Cloister at Munich, gave me a striking description of the dejection with which the opposition party returned from Rome. What could they do? They were obliged to sacrifice their intellect to the external unity of the church, and their knowledge of church history to logical deductions. Those were fortunate whose ample knowledge of church history did not cause such scruples in them as were experienced by the author of the "*Causa Honorii.*" The great majority, to begin with Pio Nono himself, were of this stamp. "*Ubi Papa ibi ecclessia,*" where the pope is there is the church. In this sentence a certain Bavarian village

* Compare "*Apologetische Vortraege*" etc. Note 22, p. 307.

priest, with whom I carried on a somewhat lengthy Latin discussion, some time in the fourth decade of this century, summed up his whole stock of theology. How to defend this sentence over against the great schism and the reform councils was a matter of no concern to the good man. This occurred long ago, it is true. But in this sentence is contained already the whole of vaticanism. According to this the Romish church was the same as formerly. But it is still a different thing when such a deduction from a principle is actually made and set forth as an essential article of faith, thus subverting history and setting it into a totally different light. For in this wise the whole system of papal declarations, dating from the middle ages, as formulated by Gregory VII in his dictate, and carried out by Innocence III, is sanctioned, and it becomes a dogmatic claim, as well as a claim of the syllabus, to confess that the popes with their pretensions never overstepped the bounds of their power. Above all is that declaration also sanctioned, which was made by Boniface VIII and repeated by the Lateran council of Leo X, viz., that it is necessary to the salvation of every creature to be subject to the pope; that declaration in which our fathers rightly perceived that the anti-Christianism of the Romish Church lies. We will readily understand that many a conscientious theologian of that church found it impossible to deny his better knowledge for the sake of that dogmatic claim. It was a peculiar happening that Doellinger, the champion of the ultramontane tendency, should become the leader of the opposition party. In course of time he changed, and has, at least in part, corrected his former misdeeds against our church and the Reformation. It is with the deepest sympathy that we look upon the fate of those honorable divines, in the

Romish Church, who found themselves compelled to take sides with the fruitless opposition of the Old Catholics. This opposition was unfruitful not only on account of the alternating favor or disfavor shown it by the state. From the very outset we could not fill ourselves with enthusiasm for Old Catholicism, and I personally expressed my doubts to Doellinger. Even if the liberal elements, which in the beginning had united with the opposition party, and were greeted as companions, would in course of time fall away or be cast off, there would still remain a double want. I directed Doellinger's attention to this. In the first place, it was a mistake that the whole thing was considered more as a matter of scientific truth than as a matter which concerns the salvation of the soul. But what would the farmers among the Bavarian mountains care for the "*Causa Honorii?*" In the second place, it was a mistake to think of reforming the Romish Church and at the same time pass by the "*Augustana*," that banner planted by the Lord for the Church in a highly decisive hour, and to which all the churchly reformers must assume some relation.

At all events, the danger was no small one and Vaticanism proved an embarrassment for the Romish Church among us. At this juncture the state with its "Kulturkampf" came to her aid and nicely helped her out of her embarrassment. To say much about the Kulturkampf—"*locus a non lucendo*"—is not necessary at this time. When on our part—and we are pretty much alone even as regards the religious pass—we at once protested and raised a warning voice, we were called enemies of the empire. The spirit of thoughtlessness, which had learned nothing from the mistake at Cologne in the 3d decade, was not ready to receive advice in those jolly times of chasing the "black game," as it was

haughtily termed. Now no one wants to know aught about it; no one is ready to confess that he helped to do this. Those who applauded loudest are now loudest in condemning the whole controversy. Should Rome respect such an enemy? This controversy has been of the greatest service to the Romish Church. In the eyes of the people it gave her a martyr's crown. Everywhere it aroused the congregations, causing them to offer stout resistance and to bring great sacrifices. It has made the Romish Church of Germany more Romish than it ever was before. I shall not speak of the fact that this controversy affected also the Evangelical Church, though she knew not why this was the case; nor of the fact that peace was restored with Rome without any regard to the Evangelical Church, and that, too, a peace which effects our Church. I fear if I should touch upon this I might be led into bitterness, but that will be of no benefit. Perhaps Gregorovius, who knows the Romish affairs, may be considered an unprejudiced party. In an essay recently published by him on the Italian Philosopher Augustus Vera he says concerning the Kulturkampf*, that it was begun in an awkward storm and then led step by step to defeat (P. 572). To-day the pope is a stranger and more dangerous power in Germany than in Italy his home, the seat of irreligion, as claimed by Vera. Finally, led by our own weakness and the consequent necessity of gaining that power, we have artificially augmented that power (P. 573). There was a time when the pope was publicly designated as the enemy of the State and of the empire. Since then more than one friendly visit has been made to Canossa (P. 574). At the 500th anniversary of the Heidelberg University, the place of honor was given to the pope, while

* "Zeitschrift fuer Allgemeine Geschichte," 1887, No. 4.

his embassador, conveying the list of books contained in the noted Heidelberg library at Rome, occupied the first place among the congratulators. The pope has not only been made the arbiter in questions relating to some wild islands in Oceanica, but in the most vital German affairs he has been promoted to the office of dictator and law-maker of a Reichstag party (P. 575). Our church policy indicates the spot where Siegfried may be wounded. The best thing we could do was to see the mistake and to put and end to the Kulturkampf. But it is to be feared that we must pay dearly for peace (P. 576).

These are not my own words, but expressions of Gregorovius. Much, indeed, is said about the pope's love of peace. But "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" (Jer. 13, 23.) Is it a wonder that the self-consciousness of the Romanists has risen to the highest, and that they do not consider it necessary to hide their arrogance?

There are three stages which mark the development of papal powers. The first is the absolute rule in the Church, the second is the rule of the Church over the State, the third is the rule of the pope over the world.

The first stage has already been gained. To gain the other two is the aim of papal policy. It has fostered this idea at all times. Policy does not look to the world of realities, but works also on the fancy of the people. What we have experienced is well adapted to work upon the fancy. The Carolina affair may have been meant for a mere toy or for a compliment with which to flatter vanity. Nevertheless it has produced its effect. It does now seem, as has been boasted, as though the pope did rule the world. A theocratic rule of the world is in fact the future aimed at by Rome.

For, since the Lord is called King of kings and Lord of lords, and rules the world, and the pope is His substitute and vice-God* on earth, it follows, according to Romish logic, that the rule of the world belongs to him. The insignificant difference found in this that Jesus has a spiritual rule, through His Word and Spirit, in the heart, while the pope seems to rule by means of external commandments and compulsion is not taken into consideration at all. The rule of the pope presupposes the destruction of the Evangelical Church. And the peace tendency, exhibited towards the German Empire, in spite of the resisting elements in the Vatican, by the present pope, aims such a blow at the Evangelical Church. It is desirable to have a free hand and a concentrated force for this work. To do this is, by them, considered entirely right; for when the Church of the pope fights against Protestantism, it considers itself as fighting the devil. According to the Romish catechism it is a demoniac deed when another than the Romish denomination applies the term "church" to itself. The "*Catechismus Romanus*" teaches: "Only the Catholic Church (the church of the pope) is ruled by the Holy Spirit. All others, who besides her claim the name of 'church,' are ruled by the spirit of the devil. This is told us, though we do sing:

'O Holy Ghost descend, we pray,
Abide with us from day to day.'"

When Goerres spoke of a common Christian ground of the Confessions, Laurent, the deceased apostolic vicar, who

*It has been repeatedly denied, on the part of Romanists, that the pope is called "Vice-God." But compare, for example, Innocence III., Lit. 1, Ep. 335: "Romanus pontifex non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris." Ep. 326: "Non hominis puri, sed veri dei vere vicarius appellatur."

was to have his seat in Hamburg, said: "The Catholic Church has at all times considered herself the sole possessor of the Christian religion. Christ is nowhere to be found except in her. Outside of the Church (Romish) there is no Christianity in whatever form. All that may appear as Christianity outside of her simply *appears* as such."* Here we have our sentence: Christ does not dwell with us and we have no part in the Christian religion, so that we are not worthy of the name of Christians. Laurent writes, page 554: "In Roman Catholic countries, it is not the custom of the people, as in fact not of the Church either, to call the Protestant Christians. The people do not speak of Catholics and Evangelicals, but of Christians and Protestants." But if we are not of God or of Christ, we must necessarily be of the devil. Laurent continues, page 258: "The real origin of all heretics is, and will be, the devil. All heresiarchs, and none so plainly as Luther, have possessed this diabolical character."

From this may be seen what we may expect from that quarter, or at least what is intended for us. The peace which Prussia concluded with Rome has richly given to Rome the necessary equipment for its warfare. If, according to Monteculi's view, money is primarily and secondarily and thirdly necessary to carry on a warfare, and if Rome could comfort itself with regard to the attacks of the Old Catholics, because money was lacking there, we must remember that Rome has money, while we perhaps seriously resemble Old Catholicism in this respect. During the trouble, Prussia took good care of the church money. Now the Romish

* K. Moeller, "Leben und Briefe von Johs. Theodor Laurent. Als Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts zusammengestellt." Triers 1887, Paulinus-Druckerei, page 552.

Church of Prussia, if I am rightly informed, receives no less than 15 millions of marks in one pile as a peace-offering. Besides this she receives other and princely support, namely, 3,709,456 marks annually for the bishops and their inferiors. This is 180,904 marks more than prescribed by the bull "*de salute animatum*" of 1821, and, as is well known, much more in proportion than is received by the Evangelical State Church. There is thus no lack of money to carry on warfare. Since the orders are making their entry by crowds, there is also no lack of the necessary troops, which are subject to any disposition, according to a definite plan, and for the most manifold purposes.

This work is supported and assisted by a press which is most thoroughly organized and handled. Beginning with the learned works, issued by the Goerres Society, continuing with the "*Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*," and the "*Broschueren-Cyklus*" for Catholic Germany, and these, in turn, assisted yet by the politico-churchly press, there is an abundance of printed matter showered in upon the people that cannot fail to have its results. If to this we add the advances which are being made by those in high positions, with regard to the representatives of the Romish Church; the care with which everything is avoided that could be offensive in that quarter; the treatment and honor shown the bishops, who, as they themselves declare, are the servile servants of the pope—*ad pedes tuos provoluti*, as they close their reports —treating them as the consuls of some foreign power, deserving considerations like none other, while, on the contrary, the Evangelical Church appears like a church of second class, it must be clear to every one that, no matter how external this may seem, this cannot fail to exert its influence upon the feelings entertained in different circles.

Many indeed see in the pope the pillar of the conservative interests. The pope ever tries to commend himself as the rock of safety for all authority and for the life of the nations and states. He is ever active in suspecting Protestantism as the source of every revolutionary movement. But, for all this, infidelity came to us from France, and finds a home there in quite a different sense than among us. The Romanic countries, standing entirely under Rome's sway, have long since been the hearths of revolutions, the fires of which seem to be unquenchable there, while Protestant countries are the countries of order. What is to be thought of the friendly relation to the thrones, has been revealed by Cardinal Manning in a letter addressed to a North American bishop, and relating to the Knights of Labor. He says: "Thus far the church has held with the dynasties, now with the people. The bishop stands nearest to the people. The programme for the future is: 'The church and revolution.'" That is: The other institutions may be dissolved so that the church may gain the more hold. It will not be surprising to us to hear that this voice is officially disclaimed. But Cardinal Manning knows what he says. His only mistake is that he spoke too frankly and prematurely. Have we not had a prelude to this in the summons, on the part of Romanists, to the Democratic "Landsturm?" Even though countermanding orders were received which were obeyed unwillingly and with mutterings, a trial has been made and may soon be repeated with renewed vigor.

If Rome claims to solve the social problem, lying spinx-like in the way of the future, then the almost incredible condition of the working-class in Belgium and the socialistic developments in that country, witnessed by us all,

may serve as vouchers, given by the workingmen to the Romish clergy, swarming through Belgium like in few other countries. Rome's boast is vain. It has, however, succeeded in gaining the favor of the mighty and to make them subservient to its plans. Its plans are to carry on a war of extermination against the Evangelical Church. The present sees them up and advancing along their whole line against us. Thus we are forced to resist in the interest of our church and, we dare say, in the interest of our nation.

We farther state that the resistance forced upon us can only be carried on successfully, if we stand on the Scripture ground occupied by the Confession of our church.

"Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit," says the Lord of hosts, through the prophet, Zech. 4, 6. Our first thought dare not be to turn to the state for help. Our chief help is not found there. It is well known that every kingdom is sustained with just those means which were used in founding it. Although temporal powers, in the time of the Reformation, came to the aid of the Gospel, these powers did neither bring the Gospel to light nor did they raise it to be a power over the mind and conscience. But the temporal powers of to-day are also differently situated from those. Nor has the so-called "Protestant spirit" made our church. That spirit would have vanished if it would not have had place in the word of truth and in the church founded upon that truth. Nor will German wrath against Rome do it. Though it has long since been seething in German hearts, it has been fruitless in Gregor von Heimburg against the policy of the pope, and vain in German knights. Finally, scolding will do it least of all. If it depended upon this, then Rome would long since lie in ruins and the Jesuits would have been wiped from the face of the

earth. It was Luther's testimony regarding the blessed truth, that a sinner is justified alone through faith in the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, as he had learned it from the Scriptures and experienced it in his heart, about which the Evangelical party rallied to found the Evangelical Church, after Rome had expelled them, and had rejected that testimony. That testimony is treated of in our Confessions in its various aspects, and forms the foundation and center of our church-experience. Here alone lies our strength. This alone is our weapon against Rome, and we shall not exchange this divinely-forged sword for any other. It was with only this weapon that our fathers carried on successful warfare against the Romish error and the Jesuitic lie. This was done from the day which gave us faithful Martin Chemnitz' "*Examen Concilii Tridentini*," a volume deserving unlimited praise and constant perusal, to our own day. Here alone we must, therefore, take our position. Here lies our strength and our union. If we leave this ground, we are weak, though we should receive in turn the strength of ever so many confederates.

This must prevent us from entering the alliance to which we are invited. Permit me here to speak a candid word with regard to the *Evangelisher Bund*. We are not insensible to the causes which called it forth, nor do we refuse to recognize its right to exist. We have a feeling of oneness with many a noble and churchly minded man belonging to it. We do not ignore that which is just and wholesome as expressed in its various declarations and petitions. But, for all that, we cannot enter the "Bund." The number united is too much mixed for us. We cannot join together in church work with such as are disinclined to accept our confessions or are doubtful with regard to them. Here the

question is not concerning some external affairs in which we could unite with three of a different kind, here the question pertains above all to the defense of the holy of holies of our church. How can we successfully engage against Rome if we unite with those against whom we must, as circumstances may require, turn our weapons? A divided army cannot be victorious. A kingdom divided against itself must fall. The attempt has indeed been made, and we acknowledge the endeavor, to set up a positive confession, pledging faith in "*The only begotten Son of God*" and in the "*Principles of the Reformation.*" But what is meant by "The only begotten Son of God?" This may seem like an un-called-for question. May we be excused for putting it, for much and varied experience of late days has made us somewhat distrustful as regards the "art" of using language. And which are "The principles of the Reformation?" The language is too indefinite. Are they the fundamental *doctrines?* and of *what* Reformation? Or are such formal principles meant like these: "*Free research* and the like more? It seems likely that the latter is meant. In short, we do not know what to make of this confession and, therefore, prefer to retain the confession of our church as a weapon for our hands. This weapon we know and know also how to handle. It is a good weapon never missing its aim, if only the marksman be good.

We are told: "Entering this confederacy does not give equal recognition to every tendency." This is intended to satisfy us. Is it not however a fact? "The magnanimous yielding of human thought" which is required sounds to our ears very much like "thoughtless yielding." What is called "human thought?" We fear that here also a national feeling takes the place in our hearts which a churchly feel-

ing alone should occupy. Not that we are indifferent to a national feeling. We claim to be as good Germans as any, and to be second to no one in faithfulness towards the Emperor and our realm. But everything to its place. German patriotism where German patriotism belongs, faithfulness to the realm where faithfulness to the realm belongs, but also the confession of faith where the confession of faith belongs. This is the case in the question of the church. The church is not the communion of the people and their kind, but of faith and confession. We have our alliance in our church, and the confession of that alliance is the confession of our church. It is true indeed, as attested by every experience, that the external territorial limitations of the Lutheran Church suit the task of our church less and less. We use a different measurement in our days. We cannot restrict the territory of our church to a few square miles. Our age and its calling in the time of need and in the performance of its task, has outgrown such limits and seeks to burst such a garment. An alliance of the Lutheran churches for the purpose of watching the common interests and of accomplishing common duties, reaching beyond the different territorial churches, that is what we must desire. But in the meanwhile, we shall do our duty each one in his place.

And what is that duty? I hardly need mention it. We must above all keep what we have, namely, the precious garment of a saving knowledge of the truth which was given anew by the Lord, to His Church through the labors of Luther, and which is our comfort and our boast. This we must faithfully preserve and rally around it, while we also strive to keep and advance the congregations to our care in the same. We must even apply this to those negative and dissolving elements in our own camp, which adopt-

ing the name "*Protestantism*," while they are in fact, the pioneers for Rome. We must constantly keep in view, and must keep it in view of our congregations, what a great treasure we have in Luther's testimony concerning the totality of Christian truth, which has for its center *justification by faith*, a faith which is certain of and rejoices over its salvation in Christ. This is the best protection against Rome, and the best defence against all of its attacks. The doctrine of Rome is a doctrine of doubt, the doctrine of Luther is the doctrine of certainty. Though Rome may offer ever so many guarantees in its external church observances, these guarantees can make no one certain. According to Romish claims, we must always remain uncertain of our salvation. Truly unhappy are they who, walking in this way never come to a blessed certainty, but "who through fear of death are all their lifetime subject to bondage." (Heb. 2, 15.) This is, however, just the cord with which Rome whips souls fast to itself. A certain Romish Cardinal being reminded of the fact that large numbers of Italian youths were turning infidels, said: "Just let them alone, when they grow older they will come to us again"—through fear of death. No, this is God's glory and this He asks of us, that we believe His Word which declares that He will be gracious to us sinners for Christ's sake, and will accept us sinners out of pure, free grace as His children, clothing us, without any merit or worthiness on our part, with the dues of righteousness so that, relying with confidence and with joy upon God's free grace, we may cheerfully commit our souls into His hands. This was Luther's Pauline message which touched deeply the fearful and restless minds and consciences of our people. The blessedness of this message was by no means all spent

upon Albrecht Duerer of whom he writes to Spalatin that "it helped him out of great fears." This is our concern that we may be sure of God's favor and of our salvation, and be free from fear and doubt and from an evil conscience. "The conscience of the Catholic world," writes a German arch-bishop, Melchers of Koeln, "is given in charge to the pope, and all responsibility made to rest with him. For he is the sovereign of the souls of the whole world" (Gazette de Venezia), "the absolute lord over the Catholic conscience," as it is there expressed (Fracassa). Woe to those who are said to have no more conscience, but have given it to the pope. What if the pope has no conscience either, as it happened repeatedly in former days? Even granted that he has one, must not we, every one of us for himself, appear before the judgment seat of Christ? There the pope's conscience will be of very little use to us. There nothing avails but Christ's righteousness and intercession and the mercy of God in Christ Jesus. That we may and shall be certain of this mercy of God on account of the promise and requirements of God, this is Luther's testimony with which he led the Church to a higher plane of Pauline understanding than Augustine or St. Bernhard had attained, thus giving blessed consolation to the conscience in those days, and in our days as well. It was a knowledge of this truth which, in the beginning of this century conquered Boos and Gosgner and Henhoefer, and caused that movement in the Romish Church which forms one of the brightest pages in its history. It was that also which, here and there, won whole congregations for the cause of the Gospel, though we kept no book account of it and make no boast of it. They are, however, recorded on God's book. Let us, then, hold fast to the testimony of our Church. Let us employ it diligently by word and pen against Rome and against those false friends who, with special emphasis, call themselves "Protestants," but who are, in fact, Rome's best allies and its pioneers in our own camp. In this wise we can best meet Rome, and can lead our congregations most successfully against all attacks.

This testimony is, however, connected so closely with Luther's name that we can give up that name as little as Paul's congregation could give up Paul's name to his enemies. The "Martinites" of the first days of the Reformation have become Lutherans. This we want to continue to be to the glory of God and to the praise and pride of the people to which God gave this witness of the truth, this greatest of the sons of the German nation. It is on account of his greatness that Luther has from the first incited the hatred and fury of the enemies in a manner unparalleled in the history of the Church. The honorable Bengel could well say: "*Post Christum nemo tot calumnias ferre quam Lutherus debuit, neque ipsi apostoli,*" i. e.: "Since the time of Christ none had to bear as much calumny as Luther, not even the apostles." For it was not said that the apostles were possessed of a devil, nor did Paul's Jewish opponents fling this at him, but the opponents of Luther said this of him, as Christ's opponents had done before them. While Luther was yet living, an Italian publication declared that the devil had come and taken Luther. The book came into Luther's hands and, having supplied it with notes, he allowed himself the gratification of publishing it also. This did not, however, intimidate his foes. They have invented a complete diabolical biography of Luther, reaching back to his conception and birth and continuing to his descent into hell. It is incredible, but still a fact, that, in all sincerity, they accuse Luther's mother of having had carnal intercourse with the devil. Good Johann Mueller, pastor of Peter's Church, Hamburg, took the trouble to publish an essay entitled: "*Lutherus Defensus,*" or, as the German title runs: "*A thorough refutation of those things which the papists impute to Luther's person, given in a brief and ordered form,*" 1634, (4th edition 1658,) in order to refute these extravagancies. When this publication was followed by a reply, made by the Jesuit, Karl von Kreutzer, and entitled: "*The Undefended Luther,*" in which those lies were repeated, the indulgent Mueller came out with another reply called: "*Defensio Luther defensi,*" i. e. "*The Well-defended Luther,*"

Hamburg, 1659, in which he again took up a careful refutation. It cannot be said either that such are the deeds of individuals only, for which others are not responsible, as a Jesuit recently wrote to me, when I reminded him of those untenable statements. The rest are indeed responsible for these things, for never has any Romish authority declared those things as his and slander. These things were tolerated, and the effect which they produced upon the minds of the Catholic masses was turned to the advantage of the Romish church. Though not in as coarse language, still essentially the same abuses are repeated at prcsent. A convert, A. Arndt, in an essay published at Freiburg, 1874, and entitled, "*Where Is Truth?*" calls Luther an incarnate devil, and the Reformation a work of hell. The Romish dogmatician, Perrone, designates Protestantism as "*the pest.*" Others, judging Luther from a psychologic point of view, have declared that he should have been put into an insane asylum*, he, the man whose writings are, like those of very few others, a constant spring of mental and spiritual health. I shall say nothing about those who have called Luther a revolutionist, yes, the chief of revolutionists, him who wrote in defence of governments as no teacher of the Church has written since the days of the apostles. When he was yet cardinal bishop of Pelugia, the present pope, in a pastoral letter, designated Protestantism as "the pestilential error of errors, as a stupid, changeable system, proceeding from haughtiness and godlessness." In his Christmas address of 1883, he calls the "eresiarca Luthero" the "impius apostata,"† (i. e. a godless apostasy), and the Reformation the root of all revolutions, of nihilism and of social democracy, though these are all growths foreign to German soil, but indigenous in countries controlled by the Romish and the Greek churches, being only an importation in our land.

I must close this collection, though it could be easily

---

* Comp. „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung". Vol. 1884.

† Rev. Dr. Bruno Schoen, Dr. M. Luther, judged from a psychologic point of view." Vienna, 1874.

enlarged. We must not only drive home to the conscience of our opponents the lie which they circulate and which can hardly asked to be pardoned on the ground of ignorance, at least of excusable ignorance, but we must also show them their wrong committed against our people. It is hardly imaginable that they should not have a consciousness of the fact that they are driving a wedge of division and estrangement into our nation. They should certainly know that our Evangelical people will not suffer itself to be deprived of its hero and the joy they find in him, nor will we suffer it. We know well enough that Luther was no saint, as Rome speaks of her saints. Before the emperor and the diet at Worms, Luther declared: "I do not make a saint of myself, I do also not dispute about my life, but about the doctrine of Christ. He could indeed say that if any one could be saved by a monastic life, he could also trust to this, seeing how earnest he was in his endeavors. But he counted that all as loss that he might win Christ. Perhaps he did sometimes go too far in controversy. But it was the zeal for the Lord's honor that impelled him. If, perhaps, occasionally to the divine fire was added the natural fire of the old Adam, who is there, in a warfare as he had one to wage, to cast the first stone at him? If at times he was somewhat too unrefined, we must remember that a tough log requires a rough wedge, and that that which made him rough was his spirit of uncompromising truthfulness, a spirit which we have inherited from him, but which, I am sad to say from experience, is only too often wanting on the part of our opponents, even among the better class of them.

We are, therefore, not ready to have the pride of our people, the witness to the saving truth; who spake as none spake since the days of the apostles, taken from us or dishonored, nor are we ready to have taken from us the work of the Reformation, so intimately connected with his name, and that in spite of the mistakes and sins which fasten themselves to that renewal of the Christian Church. How could it have been otherwise? As Luther says: "Whenever a wagon is driven along the street, the mud will stick

to its wheels." We are also not ready to have this work reviled and slandered before our people. We do not think of appealing to the State attorney. He must know his duty. But our opponents shall always find us in the field ready to resist them. Let us see to it that we be supplied with the proper weapons; the proper understanding of the truth, and with a correct knowledge of the facts, in order that we may employ both of these as well in learned as in popular discussion. Zeal alone will not suffice, it must be a well-advised zeal. Let us study doctrines as well as history so that we may be able to defend our cause in either direction, and let us not lose time by engaging in all manner of side issues. If our opponents combine for attack to resist them let us do the same in manifold ways. An extensive external organization is not necessary for this purpose. It is sufficient if smaller circles are formed. The individuals composing these circles can then counsel together as to the course to be pursued, either by tongue or pen, in any given case. Let us only see to it that something good and instructive be presented, and that this be properly circulated in all congregations. Let us use the advantages offered by the press. In every case let us work and not stand idly gazing upon the battle of which we have at present only the first skirmishes.

To the merits of Luther belongs this also that he again began to teach the proper form of a Christian life. This he did in contradistinction to the self-invented spirituality of Romish saints, who think it necessary to take the Christians out of the world and out of their business if they are to walk on the way to perfection. The doctrine concerning the call or vocation, which Luther revived, as also the doctrine concerning real, Christian perfection are among the most precious jewels given our people by him. Not cowl and cap, not fasting and scourging, not cloister and monkery, not begging and idleness, not filth and fear of water, constitute real, Christian perfection. All these things those who are no Christians can also have. But to have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and to do the work of one's calling, this

is real, Christian perfection. In these words Luther sums up everything in a nut-shell. It was this that enabled our people again to go to their temporal labors with a good conscience, and prepared them for the way assigned them by the higher plane to which labor has been raised by our times. People have learned that also in their temporal labors they are serving God and can be assured of His good will. Of this I shall, however, not say more at present. I simply desired to point to it as the legitimate fruit of Luther's teaching with regard to justifying faith, from which, like a stream, thankful love flows forth, showing itself in good works. With this double testimony, as Luther has given it to us, we shall be enabled properly to direct our congregations and to equip them against the tempting voices and the allurements of Rome.

However, of what benefit is the purest truth and clearest teaching of the plan of salvation, if these cannot be applied to the people? But how shall we impress the teachings concerning the plan of salvation upon our people and upon our congregations as it should be done, seeing the enormous size, especially of the congregations in our larger cities, where there are 30, 40, 50, 60 and even more thousands of souls, making it impossible for a pastor to have personal supervision and care over the individual members? We dare not even say that this applies only to the larger cities and not to the country. It applies also to the country in many instances, especially where manufacturing is carried on and settlements spring up. And even if it did apply only to the cities, we must remember that these take the lead. The spirit which pervades them is carried into the country. We are all familiar with the sad state of affairs in this regard and need, therefore, say little more about it. It can, however, not be repeated frequently enough. Just upon this depends the present question in the Church and upon this depends for the most the decision of the present controversy with Rome. It is the unavoidable tendency of our larger cities to keep on increasing. While the provisions for supplying the spiritual wants of the people have

not kept proportional pace with the numerical growth, but have been permitted to remain the same as in former years. It is, however, the masses, congregating in the cities, that need double care. They are not the possessors of churchly traditions and customs as, for instance, country congregations are, where church customs in part supply the want of the Word. On the contrary, they are of to-day or yesterday, they have no traditions, now they drift hither, then thither. Let us confess it, here is a great neglect—a neglect of which our Church is guilty. We have lived too much off of the past and have not increased the inherited capital as the growing and changing needs demand it. How long were not the cities permitted to grow, adding suburb to suburb and still there was no hand put to work to furnish sufficient spiritual or churchly supplies. Here lies a grave neglect and we must all accuse ourselves of being guilty. We are in duty bound to furnish church-homes for the sons and daughters of our people. We, having the saving truth, are in duty bound to bear testimony to the same. We owe it to the members of our congregations that we do this, so that they be protected against the deceptions of the sects and of Rome. We owe it to our fatherland to avert the dangers for the present and for the future from such a massing of people who are religiously neglected. I need furnish no further grounds for this. In this regard there can be no difference of opinions. Nor can there be in regard to this that proper church-care in a parish is the only adequate remedy. All other means which have been employed in various ways, either by individuals or by organizations, are useful and good, but they are, and by the very nature of things can only be, patch-work and furnish but temporary relief. The main thing is still congregational improvement, at the head of which stands the pastor. The Reformation has made churchly organization a congregational matter in quite a different sense from what it was before the Reformation, therefore the improvement of the congregation is the chief aim of church-being and church-life. Let us remain in the paths of our fathers. We can say with pleasure that

the necessity of this has recently found more recognition, and that the problem before us has been taken up with more earnestness. Every one knows, however, who has an open eye and a warm heart for the welfare of the church, how much, how very much remains to be done yet. He knows also that we have no time to waste, but that the matter is urgent.

We would herewith impress these things especially upon the minds of our church authorities, asking them not to consider this an expression of distrust or of unbecoming meddling in other men's affairs, but only as an evidence of our deepest concern in the matters with which they are entrusted. Nothing is more deserving of a prominent place in their minds. We know, at least in part, with what manifold difficulties the realization of such endeavors must frequently contend. But we trust that the wisdom of our church authorities will know how to overcome these difficulties. We shall refrain from pointing to any special means or legal regulations to be employed. I would direct attention to only one thing. The Church has lately received a large number of young theologians. There are more already, or at least will soon be more, than can find immediate appointments. Let us take advantage of this and see to it that these young workmen find a field of labor. If they cannot be appointed pastors, let them be appointed assistant pastors in separate parochial circles, or in some other way, as may seem best, so that from this arrangement new and independent congregations may spring up. Our divines do not labor less than the Romish, but there are too few of them. One Romish pastor has, in proportion, a much smaller number of souls entrusted to him than our pastors have. Besides this, it becomes necessary, an account of insufficient support, that, at some places, pastors devote the time which should be given to work in the congregation, to giving lessons. This occasions a sad neglect of the interests of the Church. On the part of Rome, the pastors are seconded and assisted in their work in the congregations by the various orders of their Church. Need we, therefore,

be surprised that we cannot compete as we should and would with the Romish propaganda?

I know well enough what is the chief hinderance in accomplishing our wish. It is the poverty of our Church. Years of close observation of church affairs have convinced me that it is this which hampers and clogs every church work, and hurts the interests of the Church. If there is any point which has my sympathy in the widely discussed proposition made by Hammerstein, it is the one referring to sufficient dotation of the Evangelical Church of Prussia. If properly carried out this proposition will suffice. I refrain from saying more on this subject, since we do not here discuss the State Church of Prussia. But I could not pass it by in silence, partly on account of a deep interest in it and partly on account of our own interests. For what is done there concerns all of us also. Things differ in the different State churches. The churches are situated differently and are supported differently. We can, therefore, not judge concerning the affairs in different churches, nor are we so situated that we could present any propositions. This, however, we can say: there is a double or even a threefold reason which should prompt the States to provide sufficiently for the Evangelical Church, and to recognize the new needs brought about by this new age. These reasons are: a sense of Justice, a sense of Gratitude, and the interests of the State. *Justice* should prompt, seeing what vast and rich church-possession the civil government at one time appropriated to itself, thus assuming obligations which are not adequately met by what is done. *Gratitude* should prompt, for civil governments awe the respect in which that office is held, but which was denied it, and, in spite of every turn and twist of diplomacy, will and must be denied it by the Romish Church, to the Reformation and its doctrines. *Interests of the State* should prompt, for in the present and future dangers, threatening our State, the Evangelical Church is a moral power which can not be substituted by penal laws nor by a call of the police force and the like. Let it only be made possible that our Church can get at

and into her people as she should, and let not the Church be limited to preaching before an audience which comes and goes and nothing more. To say that the Evangelical Church endangers the State and that, therefore, another, an Evangelical "Kulturkampf" must be expected is simply ridiculous and deserves no reply.

It would, however, be only a continuation of an inherited bad habit on our part, should we be satisfied with calling upon the help of the state, expecting all that is necessary from it. Times have changed, and make greater demands upon every one for personal participation and voluntary labor. We must learn everything. Giving must also be learned, especially giving not only for general benevolent purposes, but also to meet the needs of the Church. Let us learn from the Middle ages in this respect. How richly the Church was then remembered with donations and endowments. To-day yet we enjoy its beneficence, where its gifts have not been pocketed for other purposes. The motive for giving is indeed a different one now from then. But should love and thankfulness not be as powerful as the expectation of a reward.

If we are to approach the members of our congregations with admonitions and exhortations, I would sum up what is to be said here into the general exhortation to faithfulness and service. Let us preserve and show the faithfulness of our Church. Faithfulness is the most German of the natural virtues of our nation. Let us permit the Spirit of Christ to cast it over into faithfulness to the Church of the Gospel, the restorer of that blessed Word, which gladdens our hearts and consciences with the certainty of God and His grace and which has brought about the blessed union between our Lord and ourselves, a union which God being willing, nothing can separate. Let us show faithfulness towards our Church in every respect and in all circumstances of life. If the Romanists hold fast to their church and are not ashamed publicly to confess their adherence to the same, should we do anything less for the Church to which we owe so very much more?

One is here reminded of the question concerning mixed marriages. The importuning and insisting which Rome applies in such cases lead many a ripening member into its bounds. It is a shame for Evangelical Christians if, from effeminate yielding, or by other causes, they are induced to deny their Church. How can the Romanists respect a Church whose members have so little faithfulness? Once a certain military man came to the venerable Boeckh of Munich to announce his intention of entering into matrimony with a Catholic lady of Munich. In the course of the conversation Boeckh asked: "What shall be done with the children?" The soldier replied: "My dear sir, in order to keep peace, especially with my future mother-in-law, I was finally obliged to yield. Our children shall be Catholics." Boeckh silently eyed him for a while, then approached him and touched a badge of honor, which adorned the soldier's breast, saying: "I should think that a man who has served his king and his fatherland so faithfully could also have stood something for his Church and for his Lord in heaven." The man's eyes filled with tears as he said: "My children shall be Evangelical." He left and kept his word. Such faithfulness our church must ask of all its members and the servants of the Church must see to this; but the legal regulations of the Church must assist them.

Faithfulness and service, these are the thanks which our Church asks and expects of its members, as well as the individual service, where circumstances will permit it and where opportunity is offered. Our time requires a greater exertion of our strength than former times, it also needs voluntary help to do the work amassing around us. Every time of war requires the offerings of volunteer service as well as the giving of one person. The call is: "Volunteers to the front," under the command and direction of the Church. Several years ago, I read in a Democratic paper of Berlin: "Keep away with your pious speeches. We have heard those long enough. With them you cannot coax a dog away from the stove. Sisters of charity and deaconesses are the only things which we respect in Christianity." Personal

services may assume all kinds of forms. It would not be good if the Romanist would have to put us to shame in this respect. We cannot hold up a special crown of merit nor can we bestow a special or peculiar holiness. The love of Christ must constrain us, and that is enough. If there is to be warfare between Rome and ourselves, let us wage war to see which can furnish the best proof of unselfish love, not in order externally to rule over the world but to subdue it internally.

The testimony of the blessed truth concerning the free grace of God which justifies the sinner believing in Jesus Christ, this testimony as Luther gave it to us carried among our people by word and pen; the joyful and hopeful fulfilling of our calling, each one in the place assigned him by God; enduring faithfulness towards our Church, which taught us that blessed truth and this joyful and hopeful life in our callings; and the service of grateful love which seeks to heal the wants of life, especially of the present, these are above all the weapons with which we desire to carry on the warfare before us.

We lift our eyes far above the strife on earth to Him to whom the Father said: "Scheblimini, sit thou at my right hand," and who has been made the Head of the Church, all powers and might being subject to Him. We know that our Church, seeking only His glory, is safe in His hands, and, are therefore, comforted as regards the present and the future of His Church and our Church. We will therefore say in conclusion with Luther:

"I love indeed the worthy maid
And never can forget her.
To her are virtue's honors paid,
My heart is taken by her.
I hold her dear, and if from fear,
Or other harm, I feel alarm,
She gives me sweetest solace."

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VIII. OCTOBER, 1888. No. 5.

HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES.

THIRD ARTICLE.

The doctrine that each passage of Scripture has but one sense, which it is the interpreter's task to ascertain and set forth as the sense of the Holy Spirit in the words interpreted, is supposed to be inconsistent with the concession made, that there is a mystical as well as a verbal sense contained in the Holy Scriptures. It is therefore necessary to devote some further attention to the principle stated, with special reference to this mystical sense. This is the purpose of the present article.

The word mystical, as its etymology suggests, is used to indicate a sense that does not lie upon the surface, but is hidden from view and can be found only by looking beyond the words. These may be perfectly clear and yet embody a mystical meaning which is different from that which the words directly express. The two are so distinct from each other that an interpreter may reach certainty as to the verbal sense of a passage without finding its mystical sense. The latter is the meaning of the object or action which the words designate. It is not a second sense which is expressed by the words. These have but one sense in passages that convey a mystical meaning as well as in all other passages.

When we read, Acts 21, 10. 11, "There came down from Judea a certain prophet, named Agabus; and when he was come to us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet," we have no difficulty in understanding the words. They state a fact, and when we have apprehended this, the words have conveyed their meaning. But the fact had also a further meaning which we probably never would have ascertained, if it had not been expressed in the other words of Agabus which follow: "Thus saith the Holy Ghost, so shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles." It was a symbolical act that meant something which the words describing the act do not mean. God often uses objects and actions to express His thoughts, and the passages in which these are described have a mystical sense: the words present the thing, and the thing presents the thought, so that there is a sense of the words, which is always but one, and the sense of the thing, which is also but one, though it is not the same. The mystical is the sense designed to be conveyed by the Holy Spirit through the medium of the object or action which His words indicate. Thus we read that when the prophet Jonah was disobedient to the voice of the Lord and sought to flee from his duty, and he was cast into the sea, "the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah; and Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days aud three nights." Jon. 1, 17. It is a historical fact which is thus narrated. The words are easily understood, and they mean what they say. They have no other meaning than that which they plainly express. And yet the passage has another meaning. It is mystical. When we have understood the meaning of the words, that which the verbal sense has brought to our minds is designed to

serve a further purpose. It also has a signification. It was symbolically prophetic. When the scribes and Pharisees asked the Lord for a sign, He said, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given unto it but the sign of the prophet Jonas; for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Matt. 12, 39. 40. The narrative in the book of the prophet is literally true, but the event which the words place before our minds symbolized our Lord's burial, and this is the mystical meaning of the passage.

It is erroneous to suppose that everything which the imagination of man might find symbolized by the things narrated in Holy Scripture is designed to be taught by the Holy Spirit and may legitimately be regarded as the mystical sense. Such a theory would undermine the whole organic foundation of faith. Any human figment could thus be passed off for divine truth. A vivid imagination may find resemblances everywhere between objects and between actions, and much of the beauty of poetry results from tracing such resemblances. So objects and actions described and narrated in Holy Scripture may be suggestive of other things which bear a resemblance or an analogy to them. But whether the Holy Spirit designed them to declare as His truth what the imagination may conceive, is another question. If the relation between the civil and the ecclesiastical authority, for instance, were such as Romanists pretend, there would be no difficulty in finding such relation symbolized by that of the moon to the sun. The pernicious error could then be proved by what is assumed to be the mystical sense of Gen. 1, 16: "God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule

the night." But one must have abandoned all hope of finding safe and solid ground upon which to stand in things pertaining to salvation before he can accept such a proof that the pope is the great power to whom all "the powers that be" are subject. Such an abuse of divine revelation can only be denounced as inimical to truth and righteousness. The mystical sense is only one. The imagination may invent scores, or even hundreds of analogies in connection with any transaction recorded in the Bible; but that does not even prove that in the passage in question there is a mystical sense at all, much less that the score or hundred fancies fastened to it are utterances of the Spirit. There are comparatively few texts which have a mystical sense, and that which enables us to distinguish them enables us also to find their one sense. For we cannot know that a passage has a mystical meaning unless the Holy Spirit Himself makes the fact known to us, and when He does this, He also gives us all the light necessary to understand the meaning which He thus designed to convey. But as words are the clearest media for communicating thought, the Holy Spirit again makes use of words to disclose the meaning of things. When He tells us what these mean, we have no difficulty in understanding them; when He does not tell us, we have no right to assume that there is something hidden in the things which our own ingenuity must discover, or that any or all of the thousand possible conjectures are meanings which He designed to convey. The mystical sense is to be accepted as the sense of the Holy Spirit only when He, in the same connection or elsewhere in the Scriptures, makes it known to us in words.

Seemingly this does away with the mystical sense entirely. What is the use, it is asked, of admitting, on the

one hand, that there is in the things mentioned in some passages a meaning distinct from that of the words which describe them, while on the other hand it is again denied that this meaning can be known in any other way than by the words which interpret them? Does not that in fact reduce the two senses to the one verbal sense, and does it not merely produce confusion still to speak of a mystical sense at all? The questions challenge an answer, and render necessary some further explanation.

It is true that a mystical sense is denied to be communicated in the Scriptures by the Holy Spirit when He does not Himself in words show us such meaning. Without such an indication we have no means of knowing that He designed the objects or actions presented to our minds by inspired words to be typical or symbolic of something else, much less of ascertaining what He designed to typify or symbolize. We certainly do contend that there is no mystical sense in Scripture that is not made known to us by the verbal sense of some passage.

But it is not true that this identifies the verbal and mystical sense and renders the distinction illusory. The two are never the same, and are never conveyed by the same signs. When a passage is said to contain a mystical sense, that sense is never conveyed by the words as a second meaning belonging to them. They have but one sense, and that is not mystical. The narrative in Genesis setting forth that Abraham had two sons, the one by a handmaid and the other by a freewoman, the one born after the flesh and the other by promise, has a mystical meaning. But the words have but one sense. They mean just what they say, and they mean nothing more. But the facts which they narrate, and which it is their purpose to bring before the

mind, have also a meaning. This we know, not from the words in Genesis, but from words which the Holy Ghost speaks in another place through St. Paul. The apostle says, "Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." Gal. 4, 24–26. These words also have but one sense. They tell us the mystical meaning of the facts in Genesis to which they refer. The verbal sense of St. Paul's words makes known to us the mystical sense of the things presented in the verbal sense of Moses' words. In both cases the words have but one meaning, and the words in the one case declare the hidden meaning of the things plainly presented in the other.

Therefore it is needful, notwithstanding the seeming identification of the verbal and the mystical sense, when the apprehension of the latter is represented as conditioned by the former, to maintain the distinction. When this is not kept in view, confusion must result. One passage may in this respect contain two meanings, one verbal and the other mystical, that the words designate a thing and the thing designated symbolizes another thing. But that it does this in the divine intention, and what the thing is which is thus symbolized we can know only from clear indications given by the Spirit Himself through the medium of words. Thus the mystical meaning of one passage is made known to us by the verbal meaning of another. Accordingly there are not two meanings to be gathered from one group of words, nor is the sense of the objects or actions presented by the words to be arbitrarily determined by each individual to

suit his purpose or pleasure. Luther, referring to Romanist abuses in this respect, justly remarks: "Even if they were ingenious enough to assign a spiritual fulfillment to the symbol, it could not stand unless they had a manifest text of Scripture which connects the symbol and the spiritual fulfillment. Otherwise each one could make of it what he pleased. For instance, that the serpent which Moses lifted up signifies Christ I learn from John 3, 14. Without this guide my reason might make wild work of this type. Again, that Adam was a type of Christ I know not of myself, but am taught by St. Paul, Rom. 5, 14. 15. Furthermore, that the rock in the wilderness represented Christ I am told not by reason, but by St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10, 4. No one can explain the symbol but the Holy Ghost Himself, who gave it and who fulfills it, so that the word and the work, the symbol and fulfillment, and the interpretation of both, all come from God Himself, not from men, to the end that our faith may be founded on God's word and work, not on man's. What was it that led the Jews astray but that they interpreted symbols according to their own fancies, without any Scriptural warrant? What has led many a heretic into erring ways but the interpretation of emblems without the Scriptures? Even if the pope were a spiritual thing, it still would be of no avail to represent Aaron as a type of him, as long as there is no passage produced which plainly says, Behold, Aaron is a type of the pope. If this were not requisite, who could hinder me from holding just as well that Aaron is a type of the Bishop of Prague? Hence St. Augustine declares that types prove nothing in controversy unless the Scriptures make their meaning evident." *Erl. ed.* 27, 112. It is therefore a well established canon of interpretation that only the verbal sense has power of proof, because

this alone can give us certainty even in regard to passages confessedly mystical.

The mystical sense is of three kinds; namely, the allegorical, typical, and parabolical. This must be distinguished from the division in vogue among Romanists, who maintain that there is a threefold sense of Scripture in addition to the grammatical meaning of the words; to wit, the allegorical, the tropological, and the anagogical. They teach, e. g. that in the words, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," Sabbath means literally the rest of the seventh day, but that this does not exhaust its meaning. On the contrary, it has a threefold meaning in addition. In the first place, it signifies, allegorically, the rest of our Lord in the grave between the crucifixion and the resurrection; in the second place, it means, tropologically, the rest to which the soul attains in Christ on earth; and, in the third place, it means, anagogically, the eternal rest of the saints in heaven. All these are mere applications of the sabbatic idea, and so far as they accord with the analogy of faith they are unobjectionable. But it is absurd and ruinous to insist that such applications of a text are interpretations of the Holy Spirit's meaning. The words command bodily rest on the seventh day, and that is all that they mean. Nothing else can be proved by them. Like all other sentences, they have but one meaning, and that is neither allegorical, tropological, nor anagogical. What we concede and maintain in regard to the mystical sense is something essentially different. Not every passage has a mystical meaning, but only those which the Holy Spirit designates as such and explains. And those which are mystical have not the three kinds of mystical meaning, but only one. They contain either allegories or types or parables, not all three at once. There is but one mystical, as there is but one verbal sense.

That one mystical sense is allegorical when that which is related in one passage as a historical fact is in another applied to spiritual things and thus made to illustrate truth in a higher sphere. Many a narrative of the Scriptures is capable of such application, and much abuse has therefore been practiced by allegorizing interpretations. Some have not hesitated to deny fundamental facts recorded in the Scriptures on the assumption that they are allegorical, and that the spiritual truth which they were designed to teach does not require the didactic narrative to be historically true. Others, while they have admitted the truth of the narratives, have arbitrarily allegorized them and thus made them prove what is not in the text nor anywhere else in the Bible. It is therefore important to observe the distinction between the allegories which the Holy Spirit recognizes and explains and those which are of human invention and can therefore prove nothing. The latter are not to be accepted as the mystical sense of Scripture, because they have no foundation in the inspired words. Nothing serious can be urged against the application of any biblical narrative for the illustration of biblical truth derived from other passages. In many cases this can be done with profit, as when the Lord's healing of the physically deaf and blind is applied to the spiritually deaf and blind, or the cleansing of the leper is applied to the cleansing from sin. But that is not what the account of these miracles was designed to set forth, and care should always be taken to state, when such use is made of historical passages, that it is not an interpretation of their meaning, but simply an application. As long as such application is in accord with the analogy of faith it is legitimate, but it proves nothing, and can at best only illustrate what is otherwise proved. An allegorical sense of

Scripture can be accepted only when the Holy Spirit Himself makes application of a narrative to spiritual things, so that the spiritual meaning of a historical fact is expressed in one set of inspired words, while the fact which is allegorized and whose literal truth is not affected by the allegorical use, is expressed in another. The allegorical sense of a passage is the verbal sense of the other passage in which the allegory is explained. Such allegories are of rare occurrence in the Scriptures—so rare, indeed, that it is difficult to adduce another example so well defined as that in Gal. 4, 22–24 as referring to the narrative in Gen. 16 and 21, where the apostle expressly says that the history is an allegory.

The one mystical sense is typical when an object mentioned in the Old Testament is designed by the Holy Spirit to prefigure another object in the New Testament. Thus St. Peter says that "the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." 1 Pet. 3, 20. 21. The flood is thus declared to be a type of Baptism, which is its antitype. Manifestly there are not two senses in the words describing the flood, as there are not two senses in the words by which the Holy Spirit makes known to us the typical meaning of the flood. The words of Moses which describe the great catastrophe have no other purpose than to narrate the history which they set before our souls. But the waters which washed away the wickedness of the earth, while they bore up the ark in which eight souls were saved, are an emblem of those waters of grace which in Baptism wash away our sin and rescue us from the perdition to which we are otherwise doomed. The Holy Spirit so applies the fact, and therefore this is the mystical sense of the narrative con-

cerning the flood. The words of Moses describe the fact, and the words of St. Peter make known its typical import, which was designed by the Holy Spirit, but which we can understand only through the words explaining it. So St. Paul says, "Death reigned from Adam to Moses even over them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of Him that was to come." Rom. 5, 14. Adam is here called the type of Christ, as in the words of St. Peter Baptism is called the antitype of the flood. We all have our old natural life from Adam, we all have our new spiritual life from Christ. "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." That Adam and Christ stand to each other in the relation of type and antitype we know through the words of the Holy Spirit Himself. It is the verbal sense that renders us sure of the mystical sense—the words in one passage making us certain of the meaning of things used as symbols in another.

Types are numerous in the Scriptures, and therefore the greater care is necessary in their interpretation. The Mosaic institutions generally were shadows of things to come. But when a person, or an object, or an event is once known to be typical, it does not follow that they are so in all their attributes and circumstances. The high priest was a type, not of the pope, as Romanists dream, but of Christ. He offered sacrifices for the sins of the people, and thus prefigured our Savior, who redeemed us by His great sacrifice upon the cross. But the high priest offered sacrifice for his own sins as well as for those of others, and he repeated the sacrifice every year. In these respects his work was not typical. "For such an high priest became us who is holy, harmless,

undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens, who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for His own sins and then for the people's; for this He did once when He offered up Himself." Heb. 7, 26. 27. So far as a person or thing is sinful such person or thing cannot be typical. The carnal cannot as such be an emblem of the spiritual. David is a type of Christ, but David's violation of the fifth and sixth commandments can of course typify nothing in the sinless Savior of the world. It must be observed, moreover, that because of the intimate relation between the type and the antitype the latter sometimes bears the name of the former. This does not render the two one and the same thing, and the interpreter must guard against confounding them. Thus saith the Lord, "I will set up one Shepherd over them, and He shall feed them, even my servant David; He shall feed them, and He shall be their Shepherd." Ezek. 34, 23. So in another place it is said: "Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God and David their king, and shall fear the Lord and His goodness in the latter days." Hos. 3, 5. David typically is Christ, and therefore the latter is spoken of by the name of the former. The typical is really the sense of Holy Scripture when the Spirit who inspired it points it out as such. Pure conjecture on the ground of perceived or imagined resemblances and analogies gives us no assurance and can have no weight as proof.

The one mystical sense is parabolical when events are narrated not for their own sake, but for the purpose of illustrating spiritual truth. A parable is a comparison, in which earthly events are made to symbolize the heavenly. While it closely resembles the allegory, it differs from the latter in several important features. The allegory applies historical

facts to spiritual realities. These historical facts are narrated for their own sake, and the narrative has therefore a purpose and a value independently of the spiritual lesson which they may serve to teach. The application, moreover, is made in another passage, whose verbal sense makes known to us the mystical import of the history which it applies. In the parable, on the other hand, the occurrences narrated have no historical value. They may be feigned in the special form which they assume in the parable, although they generally state facts of every-day occurrence. The story is simply told to illustrate the spiritual truth which becomes apparent by means of it. Therefore the narrative never stands separated from its spiritual purpose, as if its object were to state historical facts, but embodies the key to its mystical meaning. The words describe the earthly thing which is an emblem of the heavenly, and give us the necessary suggestions to enable us to apply the occurrences of the lower sphere to the illustrations of the higher. The parable always presupposes some knowledge of spiritual things. It makes these plainer by comparing them with the earthly things of daily experience, but enough acquaintance with the spiritual is necessary to enable us to discern the special points of comparison which are embraced in the general statement. In some instances our Lord Himself makes the application and thus explains the parable, as in Matt. 13, 18–23, where He expounds the parable of the sower narrated in verses 3–8. But where no such exposition is given the mention of the thing to be illustrated by the parabolic narrative is a sufficient guide to make the application.

There are thus not two senses in the words of the parable, although the mystical sense is brought out in the same passage whose verbal sense presents the thing containing it.

Thus when our Lord says that the "kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king which made a marriage for his son, and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding; and some made excuses, some persecuted the servants, and some among those that finally came had not on a wedding garment—the words mean precisely what they say. They describe these occurrences, and have no other meaning. But these occurrences have a spiritual import, which is suggested by the statement that the kingdom of heaven is like these things. There too the Lord sends out servants to call men to the treasures of the Gospel, and there too some make excuses, and some persecute the servants, and among those who outwardly come some are not inwardly clothed with righteousness, and thus few are chosen, notwithstanding that many are called. This is the lesson which the narrative illustrates and was designed to illustrate, and this is the mystical sease of the things brought before our minds by the literal sense of the words. The sense of the things described is but one, as the sense of the words describing them is but one.

Because the import of the parable is usually not explained in its particulars, but only the object to be illustrated in general is indicated, the interpreter has sometimes no easy task before him. To guard against the misapplication of any of the parts he must keep the scope steadily in view and have due regard at every step to the analogy of faith. In some instances not only the object to be illustrated is mentioned for our guidance, but also the respect in which the resemblance is meant to be inculcated; as when at the close of the parable of the ten virgins the admonition is given, "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." Matt. 25, 13.

But this is not always the case, and therefore care is necessary. The analogy of faith as well as the scope warns us not to find in the parable of the unjust steward a commendation of the knavery cunningly practiced to attain worldly ends. Neither is it necessary to search for something in the spiritual thing illustrated to correspond to every particular in the story illustrating it. The narrative frequently presents circumstances which serve to embellish or lend vividness to the story, but which have no counterpart in the spiritual object. The mystical sense is found when the lesson which the story is designed to teach has been learned, and this does not require an application of all the details of the illustration to the thing illustrated. Further than the text renders us certain it is not only not necessary, but not safe to pursue the resemblance.

While we thus admit that there is a mystical meaning to be found in some passages of Scripture, and that this mystical is not the same as the sense of the words setting forth the mystical object or occurrence, it has, we trust, been made evident that this does not imply a multiple sense of Scripture. The words have but one meaning; and when there is a mystical sense, the thing in which it is embodied has but one meaning, and the words again by which the mystical import is made known to us have but one meaning. This unity of sense must be insisted upon as a fundamental condition of sound exegesis. Its abandonment would render the Bible subject to human fancy and caprice, and deprive it of its character as a safe and sure rule of faith. No one could then be certain that what he has found in the Scriptures is really the mind of the Spirit, as other doctrines could lay the same claim to being one of the multiple senses which the inspired words are assumed to contain. The de-

nial of the unity of sense in Holy Scripture is the denial of all exegetical certainty, and the maintenance of a multiple sense is a hermeneutical heresy that prepares the way for every form and phase of false and pernicious doctrine. In opposition to such fundamental error Christians should give most earnest heed to our Lord's gracious promise: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8, 31. 32. L.

THE CHURCH COUNCIL.

There are still in force among us here and there "Constitutions and By-Laws" in which it is declared that "The Church Council is the highest judicatory of the congregation." When, as is usually the case, these same documents declare that the Confessions of the Ev. Luth. Church are believed to be a correct exposition of the doctrines of God's Word, and that for this reason doctrines and practices in conflict with the Confessions shall not be tolerated in the congregation, it appears at once that the authors and subscribers of such Constitutions and By-Laws hold the article on church authority just cited to be both Scriptural and Lutheran, or at least not in direct conflict with the teachings of Scripture and of genuine Lutheranism. The question arises—and it is not a new one among us—whether this view of the subject is the correct one? In other words, and to come at once to the chief point of our present inquiry, Is the declaration that the church council is the highest judicatory of the congregation in harmony with Scripture and the Confessions of our Church?

From the instruments themselves which appear to take an affirmative position on this question it is, as a rule, very difficult to make out on what grounds exactly and within what particular limits they ascribe such authority to church councils. Little or nothing is said, for example, from which a person might infer to a certainty whether that body is considered the highest judicatory by divine or by human right; nor is it made clear whether the jurisdiction spoken of is meant to extend with the same decisive and final authority over all the affairs of the congregation, that is, over the spiritual no less than over the temporal. The fact is that on this whole subject there is in these documents a lamentable lack of clearness and consistency; so much is this the case, that a person who attempts a harmony of the polity with the faith therein laid down, is sure to find himself ere long in a jumble of hopeless contradictions. To account for this strange state of things one would have to go back to times in the history of our church that are anything but refreshing. Suffice it to say that un-Lutheran opinions and practices have at one time crept in, and that up to this day those errors and evils continue to deface the otherwise clean and bright standards of some of our churches; and, what is worse, there is reason to fear that here and there they result in violence and wrong-doing to immortal souls.

The theory that the church council is the highest judicatory of the congregation, is, from the Scriptural and Lutheran point of view, false in all its bearings. Considered from this standpoint that body can pretend to so high a dignity neither by divine nor by human right, and do so no more in the temporal than in the spiritual affairs of the congregation. In view of how things are in this present state

of our existence, I can readily understand how some of our people might be led to submit to a supremacy of that sort; but how any pastor among us could ever lend a hand to the enforcement of an authority that is next to absolute and which is so inconsiderately placed, is more than I am able to account for. Charity constrains me to assume that on this point in particular the practice is better than the theory. But even if such be the case, the subject before us is important enough to merit a farther consideration.

When it is categorically stated that the church council is the highest judicatory of the congregation, it is natural to ask in the first place, on what grounds a position so exalted is assigned to that body, and how it has come into possession of such boundless powers, and that too over a people of God? To this it is possible to give one or the other of two answers, to wit, that this body owes the position it occupies and the power it wields either to God or to man. If it owes them directly to God, then must that order be a divine institution; and if to man, then it is a human institution. If the former be the case, it remains to be seen whether God Himself has really confided to a chosen few a trust so high; and if the latter, whether men have the right before God to establish over themselves an authority of the kind mentioned. Whichever it may be, let us test the case.

Investiture with powers and privileges of some sort or other is a factor essential to the act whereby a particular order of men is called into existence. A church council is such an order; it is an official body, and hence it is in possession of certain rights and duties. This much will be conceded on all sides. But now, unless it can be shown that this body of men is an order of God's own appointment, it must be farther admitted that whatever may be the authority it has

received from other sources, it has none directly from God. The endeavor to vindicate to the councils of Christian congregations the character of independent divine institutions has, to my knowledge, never been made among us by any one; and if such a thing were ever attempted, the undertaking would be sure to end in ignominious failure. The Scriptures indeed furnish examples showing that the churches may set apart a number of men for work such as is now generally assigned to church councils; but there is nowhere a word of command that makes the establishment of such an order obligatory on the churches. At the most, Scripture examples go to show what may, not what must be done. In the proper sense of the term divine institutions, no less than divine obligations, require for their creation and support nothing short of divine commandment. And in want of such a command establishing, or enjoining on the churches the establishment of councils, such bodies can, strictly speaking, not be called divine institutions; and that being the case, they cannot be said to possess and exercise powers by an ordinance of God. It is not implied in this position on the question that the work which a church council may be called to perform is not enjoined by God, or that the establishment of such bodies on the part of congregations is, in the concrete, a matter of indifference; by no means; all that is meant to be said here is, as stated in the outset, that God Himself has neither instituted nor enjoined the establishment of this order; and then too, that congregations are not divinely obligated to work either by or under these bodies.

The only passage that might possibly present some difficulty here, is 1 Cor. 12, 28–31, reading as follows: "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily

prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversity of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret? But covet earnestly the best gifts"; etc. Attention is here called to the fact that in view of the diversity of workings required of the Church the latter has also received a diversity of *charismata*, or gifts to enable it to do its work; moreover, that different gifts are bestowed on different members, and that as a result there is a division of labor, and a multiplicity of offices and of officers to occupy them. If now it be remembered that God Himself bestows these gifts, that He bestows them distributively, that by so doing He plainly teaches the wisdom of dividing to every man his work according to the gifts received, and lastly, that He moves the Churches to act on the plan thus pointed out —then do we see at once what Paul means when he says, "God hath set in the Church" etc. Whatever these words may imply beyond this, there is certainly nothing in them from which one would have to conclude either the existence in every church of a body of men appointed of God Himself to govern it, or that the churches themselves are enjoined of God to set apart just such a governing body and no other. If an injunction of God to this effect were anywhere found in Scripture, and on which St. Paul might have based his declaration, then would we be forced to the conclusion that every congregation which fails for some reason or other to have a church council by such failure transgresses a plain commandment of God; and that too under all circumstances, no matter how well it may have all its affairs attended to in some other way—a conclusion which hardly anyone would be willing to accept, and one which, if it were correct, would

place under condemnation many churches of all times back to the days of the Apostles.

The order of church councils is really a human device; and how it originated in the Church and for what purpose it was first established, appears clearly from the Acts of the Apostles, chapter six. It is there related that "when the number of the disciples was multiplied there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them and said, It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of good report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually unto prayer and the ministry of the Word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose, Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch: whom they set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them. And the Word of God increased, and the number of disciples multiplied." V. 1–7. This gives all the information that can be desired on the subject. The institution is of apostolic origin; it is an expedient of wisdom; its object is, to be a help to the ministry, especially in the external affairs of the Church; the people approving the plan suggested to them, make choice of the men best fitted to constitute the order created; their election is confirmed by the ministers of the Word with prayer and the imposition of hands; and as a result, due in part to the new arrangement, the churches prosper.

It would appear from this that in the beginning the

whole work of the Church rested chiefly on the shoulders of the Apostles. From this it has been inferred by the older teachers of our Church that all the offices of the Church are really but so many functions of the one office instituted by Christ, to wit: the Ministry, and that in the course of time the work of the latter was more and more divided, and thence the many offices in the churches as they are now constituted. It is in this sense that *Chemnitz* says: "Inasmuch as there are belonging to the church-office many functions which, when the number of believers is become a large one, cannot each and all be well attended to by one person or even by a few, the custom was introduced of dividing the several functions of the Ministry into certain grades of church-offices and of assigning these to several persons or officials so that these, every one in his own station, might, by performing certain functions of the Ministry, serve the congregation in order that in this way everything might be done in an orderly, appropriate and edifying manner. Thus did the Apostles in the beginning have charge of the office of the Word and Sacraments, and at the same time attend to the distribution of alms. Afterwards, however, when the number of the disciples increased, they transferred the latter part of their ministry, i. e., that of distributing alms, to others, which latter they called deacons, that is, servants. And the reason for doing this they state to be, that they may without hindrance give themselves to the office of the Word and of prayer. Acts 6, 4. And this first introduction of grades and orders into the ministerial office in the Apostolic church shows us on what grounds, in what way and manner and to what end and use such grades and orders are established; to-wit: that, according as a congregation may be constituted, the several functions which belong to the Min-

istry may be executed with greater facility, correctness, industry, and in good order and with a certain dignity unto the edification of all." *Examen Concil. T. II.* 13. *p.* 594.

This view, which holds the deaconship to be an integral part of the ministry, explains why the command of God to the churches to establish among themselves the ministry is by the German version of the *Apology* extended also to the office of deacons. This appears also from a comparison of the two texts; for which the German says: „Denn die Kirche hat Gottes Befehl, daß sie soll Prediger und Diakones bestellen," the Latin simply states: "*Habet enim ecclesia mandatum de constituendis ministris*—". *Mueller, p.* 203.

That the Apostles had at one time or other received command from the Lord to introduce an arrangement of this kind, of that there is not the remotest intimation anywhere. On the contrary, the narrative given of it in the Acts goes to show that the Church of its own free will inaugurated this particular order of service; though there can be no doubt that it did so under the guidance and influence of the Holy Ghost. The conclusion then is that church councils are human institutions; or, more precisely, that they are a product of the Church's life and liberty. What they are, they are by the will of the people creating them; and only by the suffrage of the latter can they hold and lawfully exercise any authority whatsoever.

However, the conclusion thus arrived at in regard to the origin and specific character of councils does not cover the entire question of their authority. Whether such bodies be of God or of men, and again, whether they be above or subordinate to the congregations, are really two separate propositions. Even if, for example, the theory of their divine origin could be verified, no definite conclusions could be

drawn respecting the limits of the authority thus set up. Though strictly speaking it is not the case, let us for a moment suppose that the church council as a specific order of churchly operations were divinely enjoined, would it then follow that the body is above the congregation, or that it is supreme in the affairs of the Church in which it finds itself placed? Certainly not. Antecedent to drawing conclusions of that sort and belonging to the very premises of the reasoning, there are one or two other questions that would have to be settled first, to-wit: if God has really instituted such an office to whom has He entrusted it, and what are the conditions of the trust? Moreover, and this would be the most important point of all, what is the nature and extent of the authority that is to go with it? The ministry of the Word for example, to which this office is auxiliary, is a divinely established office; and yet is its incumbent not above the congregation whom he is called to serve for the simple reason that primarily the office belongs to the people and not to the pastor. God has given it to them, and they in turn have charged the individual incumbent with the execution of it; and hence, by the very nature of the arrangement, he is the servant and not the master. So entirely natural and self-evident is this relation of pastor to people that even the inspired Apostles observed it, notwithstanding the fact that they held office rather by a direct divine commission than by a divine call mediated through the people. "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy: for by faith ye stand." 2 Cor. 1, 24. "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." Ib. 4, 5. "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder . . . . Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight

thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." 1 Pet. 5, 1–3. Be it now whether the helps, governments and the like existing in the Church be considered as functions of the ministry and hence derived from the latter, or as auxiliary to it by human appointment, in either case the incumbents of such offices are subject to the churches calling them.

The man who undertakes to prove that the Church Council is by divine right the highest judicatory of the congregation, is sure to find himself at work on an impossible task. Not only is it required of him to point to a plain word of Scripture instituting such an order of men and investing it with a supremacy of that degree, but he has before him the solution of many other problems not a whit less knotty; for example: how to harmonize with the theory of such a tribunal the doctrine of the parity before God and among themselves of all Christians; then, too, what becomes of the doctrines of a Christian people's rights, privileges, duties, and responsibilities and the like, if they are really made subject the many to the few as set forth by that theory.

The combated view of church government is subversive of many doctrines of Scriptures, and most precious ones at that. And when we call attention to its dangerous and pernicious character, it might be said by way of protest that the body as contemplated is subject to the Word of God and this as interpreted by the Confessions of our Church. To be sure, that is something; and if the council is made up of men whose consciences are bound by the Word and who freely conform to the Confessions, it is a great deal. But it is not enough to turn error into truth and to cut off all abuses. What if these men read amiss the Word and the

Confessions and pronounce contrary to them?—not to mention the contingency that they may set aside all restrictions—what then? By the very conditions in the premises of the case, the body is a tribunal from which there can be no appeal; it follows that the congregation is utterly helpless; nothing remains but submission; insubordination would be declared a revolt against an ordinance of God. I am well aware that hardly any one would carry the divine-right theory of a government by church council to such an extreme; but logically it would drive people into just such a strait as is the one we have landed in. This would be the case especially in all those affairs in which there is no plain Word of God forbidding people to render what is exacted of them.

It remains for us to inquire whether the theory will be much improved and stand the test of truth and right and practicability from a Christian point of view if it be made to read that the church council shall be, by human right, the highest judicatory of the congregation. In view of the apostolic example cited above, there can be no reasonable doubt that Christian congregations have the right and liberty to establish church councils and to confide to such bodies certain powers and privileges. The only question is, in what particular sense and to what extent can they do this: can they divest themselves of obligations so as to have no farther responsibility as to their discharge? and can they place over themselves a tribunal amenable to nobody but itself and from whose pronouncement there is no appeal among men? These are weighty matters; and unless we can get our people to understand clearly the principles involved in the appointment of councils, committees and agencies of this kind, they will never know either how to discharge their own full duty or how to secure their own good rights in this respect.

First, then, what is the real significance of establishing a church council? In answer to this question it would be well to call attention to the following points. A Christian congregation, as is the whole Church of Christ, is a body of laborers as it is a body of beneficiaries; and every house of God is a workshop to the Lord no less than it is a dispensary where He metes out to His people His manifold grace. The work that the Lord wants done is truly great and one that to be well executed requires a diversity of gifts, thorough organization, and a well-ordered system of operation. The Lord, whose the work is but who would have His people perform it, bestows the necessary gifts, enjoins order, and providentially points out the ways that are best. Here see 1 Cor. 12; Eph. 4, 11–14; Acts 6, and other passages of a like import. Not only therefore is a division of labor among the members of a congregation allowable, but it were folly not to make use of the privilege; and when the congregation is a large one, it would be a neglect of duty almost criminal did it not avail itself of methods that are indispensable to the right accomplishment of its mission — of methods, too, that are sanctified by apostolic precedent and which the Church of the entire past has found to be so very helpful.

But when the order of working by committees is introduced — and it is of this we are speaking in particular, for church councils are in reality nothing but standing committees.— a grave and fatal error is to be avoided, the error that the responsibility for the work to be performed ends with the responsibility of electing a committee to do it. It is church work, and church work only, that we are talking of here; and by that we mean such work as the Lord Himself has assigned to His Church, and for the faithful execution of which He will hold accountable to Himself the church so

commissioned, and that church first and last and all the time. With their commission the churches have had imposed on themselves obligations, — divine obligations, because their commission is a divine one — and obligations cannot be shirked. A person who has on hand a certain work which he is by some higher authority obligated to see done, may have the liberty to engage another to execute it for him, but never can he who is the master in this latter transaction, if he be servant of another, cast upon him whom he may so engage the full and final responsibility for the performance of that work. It is true of every servant that "to his own master he standeth or falleth." In the matter before us, Christ is the Master and the Congregation His servant. As a steward in the Lord's employ the latter is free to take into its service council and committee men and agencies of that sort as much as it may be to the best interests of its grand mission to do so; nevertheless, if it were to do this same thing with a view thereby to rid itself of all farther concern and accountability connected with the work, it would by such proceeding evince anything but the good sense and will of a wise and faithful steward; and on the day of reckoning, if not before, a congregation guilty of such cunning and carelessness is sure to learn to its own grief how badly it has calculated and acted in the matter.

Not to get rid of any work and of the responsibility attending it, but in order to have the work well done and the responsibility faithfully discharged and thus to get ready for the final account, do Christian congregations have recourse to committees of one kind or another, and notably to that of church councils. But if such is the end in view and if that end is to be attained also, then must the men chosen to the office be such as are fitted for the work and as

agree to attend to it in willing submission to the body employing them, i. e., the congregation. From this it is evident that the congregation has devolving on itself a double duty, to wit, that of careful election and that of constant supervision: acting arbitrarily in either, there is dereliction on its part. True, in this whole business the congregation acts within the sphere of liberty; but liberty has its bounds and can be abused. "Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the holy Ghost and wisdom," the Apostles said when they inaugurated this order of working; and if in utter disregard of the example set them some people nowadays give office, say, to the rich to get at their money, or to the vainglorious to gratify their passion for honors, or to the disaffected to put them in good humor, or to the spiritually dying in order to revive them, etc.; yea, and if they make of the council itself a scape and a drudge in order that they themselves may in no way be annoyed by the affairs of the church, then is the office most flagrantly misapplied and then has the liberty that had the making and should have the charge of it run riot, if not enslaved itself.

Since then the appointment of a church council really signifies the creation of an agency it follows, in the second place, that the body thus called into existence must, on the one hand, be vested with some powers; but again, and on the other hand, that the measure of these powers can never be such as to render the commission independent of and superior to the body creating it. This much admittedly lies in the nature of the subject itself: for if no power of action were conferred on it, then would the body be no official one; but if supreme power were given it, then would it cease to be an agency. What exactly is to be the latitude within which a council should have the liberty to act for and in behalf

of the congregation without having first consulted the latter, is a question not easily answered and one on which opinions may differ. In the abstract, at least, it is hard to say, for example, what changes if any a council might be free to make in the business methods of the congregation, or what repairs and improvements on its property, and what amounts it might expend, etc. Such questions there are many; and to answer them wisely and well, the circumstances must be taken into consideration. As a general principle suffice it to say that the error in the direction of too little authority is far less dangerous than that where too much is given. Moreover, the instructions intended for the government of the council in all such things should be clear and definite so that disorder, abuses and dissatisfaction be avoided. Besides, churches no less than individuals are the Lord's stewards in their earthly affairs as well as they are in the higher spiritual; and if they would give a satisfactory account to the Master they must endeavor to prove faithful to things small and great; and in this last they simply cannot succeed unless they keep the control of everything coming within their stewardship. For this reason the proceedings of all whom a congregation may employ in its service should be open to its constant inspection and revision.

A church's council may serve a double purpose: it is chiefly an executive body, and acts on and in accordance with the instructions given it; on the other hand, it may itself take the initiative in some things and upon the congregation's approval carry them into effect. Except it be in faithfulness of the trust it has received, it dare in no case set itself against the will of the congregation or place itself above it; as a council its place is that of a subordinate. To declare it the "highest judicatory" in any sense and by any way

whatsoever, is the sheerest nonsense. Whatever authority there is within the church, to the church itself is it given, and to the church it belongs. To govern themselves in willing accord with the Word and the wisdom the Lord has given His people, is their right; and this right is an inalienable one. The first part of this statement no Lutheran Christian will deny; and the second it should not be so very difficult for him to understand. The keys — the sum total of all church authority in spiritual things — are by the Lord given to the church. This we have, all of us, been taught already from the catechism. The same position is maintained throughout all the Confessions; and in the Smalkald Articles it is distinctly stated that through virtue of the word, "Tell it unto the church," the Lord Himself declares the church to be the highest and final judicature. Mueller p. 333. This liberty of action and right of self-government, to be exercised in fear and favor of no one but the Lord its Giver, is an inestimable boon. But it is in itself a trust; and the day will come when the Lord shall inquire what use has been made of the powers and rights and privileges accorded with it. What a sorry answer if a people will then have to confess that they have had a dozen or so of others to judge and to act for them in the highest affairs of life — how, they do not know — yes, and that these few have exercised dominion whilst they themselves lived on in idle submission. "Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men!" 1 Cor. 7, 23. C. H. L. S.

LIFE INSURANCE.

In the year 1877 Ex-insurance Commissioner Elizur Wright said, that "there are in this country more than half a million families who have volutarily subjected themselves to a tax amounting in the aggregate to about 100 millions of dollars a year, and are under bonds, more or less, in the aggregate amount of about 400 millions to continue to pay this tax for life or for a long period." In his article in the January number of *Harper's Monthly*, 1881, on the question, "Does Life Insurance Insure?" Mr. Titus Munson Coan makes the following statement: "The amount now at risk in the American companies, 2,705 millions, though less than it was a few years ago, is more than one-twelfth of the entire capital wealth of the Union. Their yearly income is more than half the yearly accumulation of wealth in the German Empire. In New York State thirty-four companies were doing business at the end of 1878. They had over 600,000 policies outstanding, assuring 1,481 millions. Their assets were 404 millions—more than the value of the entire cotton crop of the world. Their income for the year was 80 millions—a sum equal to twice the American tobacco crop of the year, and to more than the entire potato crop; or equal, again, to the entire silk crop of India, China, and Japan."

"There are now twenty companies in France, the aggregate of whose existing assurances must considerably exceed 2,000,000,000 francs.

"In Germany (including German Austria and German Switzerland) there are fifty companies transacting life assurance business, whose aggregate new assurances in the year 1879 amounted to 275,787,828 marks. At the end of that year the number of lives assured was 749,343, for sums

amounting to 2,534,764,076 marks." *Encyclopedia Brittannica*, Article "Insurance."

In the same article "it is roughly estimated that the total assurances in force with all the companies in Great Britain amounted in 1880 to £420,000,000."

It is easy to gather from these figures that the amount of business done by the life insurance companies is enormous. Nowhere is the business more flourishing than in America. It is estimated that 1,100,000 lives were insured in the United States in 1878, whereas the number in Great Britain was 810,000. Whatever may be thought of the business, this much is certain: it cannot be dismissed as something small and insignificant.

WHAT IS LIFE INSURANCE?

"The system of Life Insurance embraces a variety of contracts by which the insurers engage to pay capital sums on the decease of policy holders or nominees, in consideration of other sums received during their life time. These contracts may be divided into two classes,—(1) those in which the sum insured is certain to become payable, provided only the insurance is duly kept in force, and (2) those which are of a temporary character, so that the sum insured may or may not become payable according to circumstances." *Encyclopedia Britannica.* Sometimes life insurance is carried on on what is called the mutual plan; that is to say, a certain number of persons agree to pay a fixed amount each to the widows or orphans of those who are from time to time called away by death. If the writer is correctly informed, the Grangers and other secret societies, as well as some ecclesiastical bodies, have such a system of life insurance in vogue among them.

The heaviest business, however, is done by joint stock companies, who agree to pay certain sums to their policy holders in consideration of a premium annually paid by the latter. This is the character even of some companies that apply to themselves the epithet "mutual." "The Connecticut Mutual," for example, is a joint stock company and does business on the same plan as the other great insurance companies.

LIFE INSURANCE VERSUS FIRE INSURANCE.

It is frequently argued that there is no essential difference between life insurance, on the one hand, and marine and fire insurance, on the other. This is a mistake. Whilst the writer does not advise any one to have his property insured against destruction by fire or water, he still is convinced that insurance on life has points of essential difference from that on property. This is admitted, too, by the writer in the *British Encyclopedia.* "It may be observed that, while life insurance has much in common with fire and marine insurance, there are some essential differences between it and them. The insurance of houses and goods against fire, or of ships and merchandise against the casualties of the sea, is a contract of indemnity against loss, and in like manner an insurance on human life may be regarded as indemnifying a man's family or his creditors or others interested against the loss of *future income* by his premature death. But it does not necessarily take the value of such income into account, nor does it relate to any intrinsic value of the *subject* of the insurance—the life of the insured party. Again, in fire and marine insurance loss may be either total or partial. In life insurance the event insured against cannot take place in any limited degree, and there is thus no

partial loss. And again (in the first and larger of the two classes into which life insurances are divided) the event is certain to occur, and the time of its happening is the only contingent element. In the other kinds of insurance the events are wholly of a contingent character." No honest man expects his house to burn down when he has it insured; but everybody knows that death will come sooner or later. We can easily determine the value of a house or other property; but who can estimate the value of a human life in dollars and cents? It is shocking even to talk of such a thing; it is blasphemy against God, an insult to humanity.

Usually a man has his own life insured for the benefit of his wife and children or other relatives and friends; but sometimes there are three parties: "1. The insurer; 2. the insured; 3. the life insured, which takes the place of the property insured in the other forms of insurance. It is an universal rule, that every insured must have an interest in the thing insured. Every man has an interest in his own life, and may insure it; but he cannot insure the life of another, unless he has an interest in the life of the life-insured; and it must be a pecuniary interest. Thus one may insure the life of a creditor; as a sister may insure the life of a brother who supports her; and this rule applies not only to all kindred, but to all other cases where there is a real dependence, and a substantial pecuniary interest, although it be not legal or technical." *New American Cyclopedia.*

OBJECTIONS TO LIFE INSURANCE.

Inasmuch as the agents of life insurance companies are constantly soliciting the members of our congregations to have their lives insured, and inasmuch as they make bold

to say that life insurance is a safe investment and that it is every man's Christian duty to avail himself of the benefits which it offers, it becomes necessary for all Christians and especially for ministers of the Gospel to examine into the nature of the claims of such agents, in order that an intelligent and conscientious judgment may be formed with reference to the whole subject of life insurance. For himself the writer has serious objections to offer against life insurance as generally carried on, even if he must admit that certain forms of business *may* be harmless and beneficial. Let the reader note well what is admitted in the last clause; the admissions simply grant that certain forms *may* be unobjectionable, but the writer is not aware that any such forms exist.

1. Life insurance is objectionable on the ground that it is poor policy when looked at even from the standpoint of reason; for life insurance does not really assure. By examining into the history of the business we find that many life insurance companies have become insolvent, and that thus their policy-holders have lost millions of dollars.

"Since 1861 thirty-six companies have started in New York State alone: in March of this year (1880) only four of them remained. From 1859 to 1878 fifty-two companies ceased doing business in this State: the most of them failed. Of all American life insurance companies, two have failed, thus far, to one that survives; while not one of our surviving large companies has yet reached the critical period of its career—the age when heavy pressure from death-claims might be expected. But that pressure, it must be added, is not likely to be put upon any of our companies very soon, for the sufficient reason that our companies confiscate the vast majority of the policies for non-payment of premiums.

This is done generally at an early period in the so-called investment. *The average duration of an American policy is only about seven years.* Of the multitude of policies which terminate yearly in our companies, only 'one in ten matures by death; the other nine mature by causes other than death.' Or, as a searching critic, Prof. Von Amriuge, of Columbia College, has put it: 'Of every ten policies which cease, but one will cease by death and expiry. One and a half will be given up for a slight compensation, and seven and a half will be absolutely thrown away by the holders.'" Mr. Coan in *Harper's Monthly*, Jan., 1881.

So far as we know this statement has stood unchallenged for more than seven years; we are therefore justified in accepting it as in harmony with the facts. Can there accordingly be any safety worth mentioning, even from a financial point of view, in investing in a life insurance policy? Standing but one chance in ten of being successful in the speculation, it is certain that the great mass of those who have their lives insured, consisting as they do of persons who have no opportunity of thoroughly understanding or investigating the principles and financial standing of the companies in which they insure, must inevitably lose their money.

There is profit in life insurance — immense profit; but it does not accrue to the benefit of the insured but of the insurers. The companies have nine chances to the policy-holder's one. No wonder that they are enormously wealthy. They know how to make money at the expense of the public. They are wise in their generation. "They make a large profit on receiving interest at a higher, and paying it (when they pay it) at a lower rate. They calculate the interest which they promise to pay at four per cent.; they

receive six or seven per cent. But the policy-holders are commonly led to think that they are to get much more than four per cent."

"In computing the risks of their business the companies use a table which gives a death rate, on the whole, considerably larger than that which it expects in practice. Having computed the chances below the average, they then pick out the lives that are above the average, and most of the companies refuse to insure any other. This selection of risks is another source of great profit. One New York company reported its gain from this resource, for eleven months of 1869, as $649,000."

"Another source of great profit to the companies has been the buying up of policies. This, happily, is not so common as it was. How it was managed we may learn from the instructive testimony of Mr. Stephen English: "'Q. [Mr. Moak]. What were the irregularities which you complained of in regard to the Continental Life?

"'A. Robberry and plunder.

"'Q. In what way?

"'A. They sent agents out all through the West; they would call upon a poor unsuspecting policy-holder, and by telling him the company was insolvent, induce him to give up the policy for a small amount, and then pocket the reserve.

"'Q. In other words, if the reserve was $600, they would get the policy surrendered for a small sum?

"'A. Yes, for $40; and then pocket the difference.

"'Q. Who would?

"'A. The president and vice-president: they have run away.'"

The profits which the companies derive from these

sources amount to millions of dollars a year. But this is not all. They have another source of profit which is more prolific than any or all of the others; "namely the confiscation, as already said, of the vast majority of the policies." "Here are some of the facts: In 1871 lapse and surrender swallowed up ninety-three per cent. of the policies that were terminated in the New York business. In 1876 one company confiscated about 2,500 policies — nearly the same number that it issued during the year; 1,254 of them were absolutely forfeited, the holders getting nothing for them. In another company, during the same year, about 3,000 policies were terminated, only about 300 of these by death. Of the balance, about 150 were re-instated; the rest, over 2,000 in number, were absolutely forfeited. Still another company in the same year, 1876, issued 8,000 policies, and confiscated (always legally) no less than 7,500. Of these, however, it bought, according to its actuary's testimony, a large number 'simply as a gratuity,' being 'not legally bound to pay anything' to the policy-holder who is behind-hand with his premiums. During the year 1879 the same company reports 8,615 of its policies as terminated; the company is thirty-seven years old, and yet only 1,156 of these policies were terminated by death! How many lapses and surrenders there were in its business does not appear in its annual report. During the year 1878 the number of policies terminated in the New York business was 87,222. Of these, 11,357 terminated by death and expiry; while 57,895 were terminated by lapse and surrender, representing the failure of 151 millions of insurance. The premiums paid upon these policies, and the profits accruing thereon, remain for the most part as profits to the companies."

It is true that recently laws have been passed in New

York and other states by which the confiscation of policies has been checked. The passage of such laws goes to show that even in the estimation of the State the morality of the course pursued by the life insurance companies in regard to the forfeiture of policies, is seriously called in question. "These laws will be a great deliverance to those who shall intrust themselves hereafter to life-insurance under the present system. They would have restored hundreds of millions of dollars to American families had they been enacted and enforced thirty years ago."

But despite the passage of such laws the insurance companies, not the policy-holders, are still receiving the lion's share of all the profits of the business. "This matter is summarized in a few words of expert testimony which I will quote from the State [New York] investigation of 1877. The case supposed is that of a policy of $1,000, payable at death, the holder being assured at the age of twenty-five years, and paying $20 annually!

"'Q. [Mr. Moak]. Of an annual premium of twenty dollars, six would be for loading, five for mortality, and nine for reserve; to secure for himself such an insurance at his age he pays $20 and gets $5 worth?

"'A. [Mr. Sheppard Homans]. Of insurance, yes.

"'Q. In other words, on the mutual plan, without expense [of agents and management, etc.,] $5 worth would pay for just as much insurance as he gets now by paying $20?

"'A. Certainly.

"'Q. You say $5 actually pays for the benefits which the man actually gets in insurance for which he now has to pay $20, or, in other words, which the present system requires him to pay?

"'A. Certainly.

"It may be said, Grant the facts of these abuses: do not these very overcharges make the companies stronger, and so accrue to the benefit of the policy-holders? They would if the companies used the money in that way. But we have seen already that the companies, even the oldest ones, let but a small part of the policy-holders' money go back to them. The agents of the companies distribute little tracts, pleading with the public for their salvation by life insurance, and pleading with more zeal and at greater expense than any tract society. One company admits paying in one year (1876) the sum of $62,000 for 'printing and stationery.' And in these tracts they announce, among many other good things, the actual payment of large sums upon their policies. But let us see what large sums, to which attention is not called in their tracts, they spend on other objects than the payment of insurance to the beneficiaries of their policies.

"The New York companies reported 80 million dollars income for 1878, and 72 millions expenditures. A considerable part of this sum was doubtless paid to widows and orphans — how much, the report does not make clear. Mr. Wright estimates that of 100 millions paid annually in premiums to all American companies about one-fourth is annually returned to the beneficiaries." That is to say, you pay one dollar and receive twenty-five cents in return. Does life insurance pay at that rate?

"During the years 1876, 1877, and 1879 a single New York company paid nearly two millions of dollars to agents. If we look back to the times of inflation in the business we shall find still higher figures. During five years, 1867–1871, the authorized companies of New York State paid forty millions to agents, and 75 millions during the same period for losses and claims." Is it at all probable that a business

transacted in such a manner can be a safe one for the policy-holders?

"The president of one New York company, after stating the amount of his salary to be $37,500 per annum, went on to say that his company had paid about four millions for their building in New York, and more than a million for their building in Boston: for the two, more than half the estimated total cost of the Cologne Cathedral." "A vice-president of a leading New York company testified in 1877 that the cost of 'luncheons' given to 117 officers and clerks in the New York office was about $6,000 a year; and he 'could not say' that the cost of luncheons and wine dinners (the wine dinners were stopped in 1876) did not exceed $10,000 per year. This is the same vice-president who could not recollect within half a million dollars the amount of the bonuses given to officers in his company."

Even if we grant that the expensive buildings erected by the life insurance companies are a good investment, it still is plain that the original cost of such buildings, the expense incurred in sending out agents to all parts of the country to solicit business, the luncheons and wine-dinners enjoyed by the officers and clerks, the princely salaries of the presidents and vice-presidents, the bonuses paid to the officers generally, the losses by reckless speculation and peculation, the cases in which large sums are given to the families of deceased policy-holders who have paid but a small sum comparatively in premiums, all must be paid, for the most part, out of the funds received from the pockets of the policy-holders. Taking all these things into consideration in connection with the lapsing, surrendering and forfeiting of policies — the process by which about nine-tenths of the policies terminate, as has been shown above — who can still

doubt whether, in the long run and in the case of the great majority of the policy-holders, it pays to invest in a life insurance policy?

It may be asked, Why do so many surrender their policies or permit them to lapse? In some cases it is because the insured find it impossible to pay the premiums demanded by the companies, unless they are willing to be deprived of many of the necessaries and conveniences of life and to sour their present existence for the sake of a few hundred dollars to be paid to their relatives or friends in the future. It must be remembered that not a few rashly get their lives insured for sums out of all proportion to their ability to pay the necessary premiums — a fact which they do not discover until they have had time to reflect and have experience how hard it is to remit the money required. Others find after a time that they are playing a losing game; and they withdraw, because they prefer to lose a part of the loaf to losing the whole. We have seen that the insurance companies sell policies to such persons only as they are convinced will live longer than the average time allotted to human beings, and that as a rule no others need apply for insurance. Now when these strong, healthy men, who have been singled out on account of their prospects of longevity, find that they will in all probability be obliged, if they continue to hold their policies in force, to pay as much as their policies call for or even more, they see that they have suffered themselves to be led into "a trap which screws up tighter and tighter till liberation comes by death." Says Mr. Coan: "A friend of mine has already paid on a life policy for $10,000 the sum of $13,000 in premiums. Counting interest at the legal rates on the payments, he is already some $15,000 out of pocket; and though he is no longer young, he bids fair to be called

upon to pay premiums for more than a few years to come. I will not call his case a common one, for very few policy-holders keep up their insurance as long as he has done. But for those who do, it is a losing investment, even when dividends have been paid; it is a game in which one cannot win even by dying."

About eighteen years ago an acquaintance of the writer had his life insured for $2,000. A year or two afterwards his wife died, and so the main object of the insurance was gone. After paying over $300 in three years as premiums and giving his notes for an equal amount, he concluded, by the advice of his children, who were unwilling that he should make a slave of himself for the sake of leaving them a few hundred dollars at his death, to take what is called a quit-claim policy, an agreement having been made with the company that such a policy should be issued in case he found it desirable at any time to cease paying his premiums. Now after paying over $300 to the company in cash and giving his notes, as before said, for the same amount, the quit-claim policy received by him calls for $150 payable after his death to his children; that is to say, the company has had the use of his $300 for more than fifteen years and agrees to pay at some future time — it may be five or ten years yet — not even half the money received. Had the man continued to pay his premiums as they became due until now, he doubtless would have paid to the company a sum almost equal to that called for in the policy.

Now such cases are by no means uncommon or rare. On the contrary, from the history of life insurance, we are justified in regarding them as the rule and the cases in which the payment of premiums is continued for a long term of years, as the exception. Is it any wonder that so

many policy-holders suffer their policies to lapse? It is indeed no wonder that Mr. Coan, to whose article, already mentioned, the present paper is indebted for many of its facts, gives the following advice: "Never take a whole life policy, to embarrass the declining and unproductive years of life."

2. But our objection to life insurance does not end here. We are opposed to it also on moral grounds. We not only think that it is poor policy, considered from a financial point of view, but we are also convinced that it is at least dangerous when looked at in the light of the Word of God.

The usual grounds which are offered as inducements for getting one's life insured imply a lack of trust in God and His providence. Many men get their lives insured because they hope in this way to leave something when they die for the support of their wives and children. They say that otherwise they will not be able to leave their survivors anything. But when we come to sift the matter we find that their action in getting their lives insured is generally coupled with the desire and the hope of receiving much more than they invest; in other words, they expect to make money by speculation and without labor on their part. But the Scriptures tell us that we are to labor, working with our hands the thing that is good, that we may have to give to him that needeth. It is not wrong to seek by industry and economy to leave something for the support of our wives and children when death shall have called us away. But in all this we must be careful not to offend against the words of the apostle! "Godliness with contentment is greatgain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a

snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil, which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." 1 Tim. 6, 6–10. In itself it is not wrong to be rich. Abraham, David, Solomon, and many other holy men were rich. God does not reject or condemn men because they are rich; but he does condemn them for making the acquisition of wealth the aim of their lives. His will is expreased by the Savior: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you;" that is, all that we need for the support of our lives shall be given unto us by our heavenly Father. Our Lord further says: "Take therefore no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Some have thought and said that by means of life insurance we are able to comply with this passage. Such was the view of the late Henry Ward Beecher. But no mistake could be greater. What the Lord means is that we should have such trust in God that we feel fully assured that He will never leave us nor forsake us, but will supply us with everything that we need for the sustenance of our bodies and souls. He wants us to have no more anxious cares about the morrow than are found in the breasts of "the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? He says, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal; for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also."

We must bear in mind that it is not a matter of chance that some men are rich while others are poor. It is the will of God that such should be the case. "The rich and poor meet together: the Lord is the Maker of them all." The true interests of society require that some should have more of this world's goods than others. Of course, some obtain wealth by dishonest means, and some become poor and remain so by sloth, waste and intemperance. By such God's will is not done. But many acquire wealth by honest means, and many also remain poor despite their industry, frugality and temperance. In such cases we can justly ascribe men's circumstances to the providence of God. If now a man labors diligently and uses economy and still finds himself unable to bequeath anything to his wife and children at his death, is he not justified in resorting to life insurance, in order that he may have something for their support? We say, No; for if he is able to pay premiums to a life insurance company he is also able to save something in some other way for his wife and children. Let him rather commend his wife and children to the same almighty and everlasting Arms that have hitherto supported him and them, and that will certainly not fail to support them in the future. We have seen how uncertain a thing life insurance is: let the companies seem ever so strong, they are nevertheless composed of poor, weak, sinful, fallible mortals like ourselves. They may fail, as others before them have failed. But God's compassions fail not; they are new every morning. Some are accustomed to speak as if they were leaving the uncertain for the certain when they forsake the providence of God and seek refuge in a life insurance policy; but they are doing just the reverse. God's promises are yea and amen and must and will be fulfilled; and He has promised that

He will take care of the widow and the orphan. "A father of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows, is God in His holy habitation." Ps. 68, 5. "I have been young, and now am old: yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." Ps. 37, 25. "The Lord preserveth the strangers; He relieveth the fatherless and widow." Ps. 146, 9. To seek from a life insurance company what we ought to seek from the Lord is not to fear, love and trust in God above all things, but to make flesh our arm, to trust in man, and to suffer one's heart to depart from the Lord; and upon such conduct the word of God pronounces a curse.

Furthermore, we object to life insurance because it is in reality no better than gambling. When a man stakes his money on a game of cards he expects or at least hopes to receive much more than he gives, and that without honest labor. When a man gets his life insured, nine cases out of ten, he expects or hopes that his relatives will receive much more than he invests in the way of premiums: the greater the receipts as compared with the expenditures, the better will his wishes be gratified. But if he has studied the nature of life insurance and understands it correctly, he must know that he has taken a mere gambling chance; it is just as if he had staked his money on the issue of a game of cards, with the exception that he has no chance to shuffle and deal and play the cards — that is all attended to by the company. Some may think that because life insurance companies are authorized by law to do business, there must be an essential difference between life insurance and gambling. But we must bear in mind that the State permits many things which are condemned by the Word of God. Some states, for example, allow the granting of divorces on grounds which we cannot recognize as right, because they are not in harmony

with the Holy Scriptures. Lotteries are generally forbidden by the laws of the states composing the United States; but the great Louisiana State Lottery has the special sanction of the laws of that state. A thing is not made right by being made legal. The fact is, too, that many of the laws which have been passed with reference to life insurance are restrictive in their character, being intended for the purpose of preventing certain crying abuses which could no longer be tolerated. Such are the laws against the confiscation of policies by means of which millions of dollars were, so to speak, picked from the pockets of the policy-holders by the companies.

Another ground of objection to life insurance is the fact that it often leads to the breaking of the fifth commandment, or at least tempts people in that direction. When men have their lives insured for the benefit of their surviving relatives, those relatives are often tempted to wish for the death of the insured, seeing that the sooner death enters upon the scene the greater will be their pecuniary gain. It is quite a difference whether we are to receive $10,000 for $300 invested, or $10,000 for $8,000 invested. Inasmuch as those who encourage and urge a man to get his life insured for their benefit, and do it, too, for the very sake of getting much for little, it must be plain to any one who understands the nature of the human heart, especially when it is not under the influence of the grace of God, that they cannot fail to be subjected by their flesh and by Satan to the terrible temptation ot doing what is forbidden in the command: Thou shalt not kill. This is true even of relatives; how much more must it be true of those who take a policy on the lives of persons in whom they have no more than a pecuniary interest! Owing to the more stringent laws which certain States have passed

in recent years, we do not hear of so many cases as formerly of what is very appropriately called "grave-yard insurance." But, although the papers do not contain so many cases of murders committed for the sake of obtaining insurance money, it still is true that life insurance sometimes becomes death assurance to the person insured. And even if the gross act of murder should not be committed, the temptation in that direction is still very strong, especially on the part of those whose heart has departed from the Lord. We are not to tempt the Lord our God by needlessly subjecting ourselves and others to temptation. God's promise of protection is with us, and we have a right to claim it and appeal to it, only so long as we remain in the way He has marked out for us; when we depart from it, we have no right to expect Him to give His angels charge concerning us, to keep us in all our ways, and to bear us up in their hands, lest we dash our foot agsinst a stone.

We claim that life insurance is also a snare to the love underlying the sixth Commandment, according to which each one is to love and honor his spouse. If it be admitted, as we think it must be, that in many cases the temptation is very great on the part of the beneficiaries of life insurance to sin against the fifth Commandment, at least in thought if not in deed, no argument is required to prove that a wife so tempted is also tempted to quench the love which should dwell in her heart towards her husband. She is also tempted in the event of his death to find consolation not in the stream that flows from the fountain of grace in the Word, but in the money which she expects to receive from a life insurance company. To seek consolation from such a source is revolting to the soul of a Christian, as one should suppose it would be revolting to the soul of an honorable heathen; and yet in-

surance agents and others have the shameless effrontery to propose and laud such consolation in the presence of a Christian wife and mother. In the early days of Christianity such things were unheard of. Ours is the age in which such shames are common—a proof of the woeful condition of things expressed in the Savior's solemn question: "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" A Christian wife ought to be shocked by the proposal of her husband to have his life insured for her benefit after his death; and a Christian husband should regard it as an insult, as well as a lack of trust in the Almighty, for his wife to make such a proposal to him. Such, too, would be the case, were we not living in a time when the love of many has grown exceeding cold.

But not only is life insurance a snare to conjugal love, it is also subversive of what is called charity toward the needy generally. "Why did he not have his life insured?" is the question, asked with a sneer, when a man leaves a widow and children who are in need of help. The temptation now-a-days is very great to shirk the duty of giving to him that needeth; and life insurance has done much to nourish that temptation. Men are prone to think that life insurance and secret societies and the various charitable institutions established and supported by the State have lifted them above the need of giving to the poor; and thus they are tempted more and more to have their hearts filled with the love of money—a love which is a root of all evil and a very strong and thrifty root at that—until there is no room left in them for either love to God or love to their fellowmen; until they are at last such slaves to covetousness, which is idolatry, that it is impossible to accomplish their emancipation and their destruction, temporal and eternal, is sure and certain.

And yet life insurance is generally urged under the plea of charity. The agent represents the company as a charitable institution and the taking of a policy as a Christian duty. Verily, Satan is at work here under the guise of an angel of light. What a hollow mockery this plea about charity is, can readily be seen from the fact that the companies refuse to issue policies to persons other than those whom their physicians pronounce sound and healthy and whom they have reason to believe are able to pay the stipulated premiums. Those who really need our help—those whom poverty and sickness have rendered helpless—need not apply at the door of a life insurance office; for if they do they will have it slammed in their faces. Of course, we do not mean to say by this that all men engaged in the life insurance business have a heart of stone, utterly impervious to the appeals of the poor; but we do mean to say that the system has such a heart, and we appeal to the facts to prove our assertion.

Our earnest advice to all who are yet outside of the net which life insurance has spread for them, is: Stay out; and to all who are already inside of it, we would say: Get out as soon as possible, even if it must be done at a great sacrifice of money. It may even be good policy for you to do so, as policy goes in this world; but if not, do the right and shame the devil any way. What boots it to gain a few dollars and endanger your soul? God's blessing cannot rest on a thing which is wrong; much less can it rest upon persistence in the wrong when we are aware of it and have been warned against it. Tear yourself away from the meshes of life insurance, and flee to Him who has said: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall

lose it; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it." A. P.

THE RELATION OF GOOD WORKS TO JUSTIFICATION.

Tr. from the German of Dr. Thomasius by Rev. L. Schuh.*

The relation of good works to justifying faith the Augustana Art. IV, VI, XX, and its Apology had already with great clearness defined. It was the fundamentally distinctive doctrine of the whole Confession "that man becomes just without works and merit," that thus works must be entirely excluded from the article of justification, while on the other hand they find their right and necessary place in the article of the fruits of faith, or, as it is wont to be expressed, in the *de nova obedientia;* here, however, it must be observed, that the expressions: Faith makes just, it saves, it obtains justification, and it obtains eternal life (the *vita aeterna, salus aeterna*) are used as synonymous.

It had already, therefore, attracted some attention, when Melanchthon sometimes in lectures and writings (1536) presented the propositions: Good works are the *sine qua non in articulo justificationis, bona opera necessaria, novam obedientiam necessariam esse ad vitam aeternam;* but through his intelligent explanation and retractation the already arising storm was yet quieted. Melauchthon relinquished those expressions, concerning which also Luther had expressed his disapproval, and withdrew to the formula: *novam obedientiam, (bona opera) esse necessariam*, Mel. Loci 1,535. More dubious, of course, the same sentence appears in the Interim, where it looked like a concession to the Romish opposition doctrine, and was there also justly antagonized.

A.) So much the greater surprise must be aroused,

* Das Bekenntnis der Ev.-Luth. Kirche in der Konsequenz seines Prinzips.

when George Major, Professor in Wittenberg and temporary superintendent of the Mansfield Diocease, here immediately after the Interim, in the year 1552 arises with the assertion: "This, however, I confess, that good works are necessary to salvation; and say it openly and with plain words that no one is saved by bad works, and that never anyone yet was saved without good works, and I say more, that who teaches otherwise, even an angel from heaven, let him be accursed."

These propositions which he expressed in a polemic writing against Amsdorf and which were immediately generally gainsayed, he also introduced at once into the pulpit, and indeed with the severest polemics against the Flacianists; yea, he defended and developed them thereupon more closely in a sermon on the conversion of Paul, which he published notwithstanding the pressing dissuasion of the Mansfield clergy. Here he retracts or defines more closely that proposition thus, that indeed good works do not merit justification, which rather is obtained by faith alone, but as fruits they are by all means necessary unto salvation, namely *ad retinendam salutem.* "When now you," it says, "have become just and a child of God by faith alone and thus Christ, through the Holy Spirit, through faith, dwells in you, then good works are so highly necessary to you, not for obtaining salvation (which you by grace without works alone through faith already have) but to retain and not to lose salvation, that if you do not perform them, it is a sure sign, that your faith is dead and false, colored and a feigned opinion." Further and in the same connection, "Our good works are not necessary alone on earth, but also before God in heaven, so that we may receive for them the glorious reward and recompense of eternal life and salvation." Instead of the expression "good works" he uses at the same place the other one: renewal, new obedience, which consists in works, new life, and says accordingly: "The new life, which consists of good works, is necessary to salvation." But he says it so, that he with this not only continually antagonizes with the greatest vehemence the doctrine of the opposite party, but at the same time designates forgiveness of sins

and renewal as the two factors of salvation, or he also makes justification, which he identifies with salvation incomplete in this life: "Salvation in this life is first, forgiveness of sins, secondly, incipient renewal unto the image of God, *item* righteousness, Holy Ghost and eternal life."

This is also essentially the doctrine of the superintendent at Gotha, Justus Menius, who since 1554 arose as the defender of Major, and who is, therefore, said to be the representative of the same tendency. For he also wishes the proposition, that good works are necessary to salvation, to pass, not indeed in the sphere of justification, but in that of new obedience, namely, as a necessary fruit of faith, *ad salutem retinendam*, or, as he later expressed himself, *ad non amittendam salutem.* How he understands this may be seen most plainly from the following expressions: "Only through faith in Christ can one become just before God and be saved. Why? Because through faith one obtains first, forgiveness of sins and the righteousness or obedience of Christ with which He fulfilled the law for us; then, that one also receives the Holy Ghost, who in us also accomplishes and fulfills that righteousness demanded by the law, here in this life incipiently and in the coming life perfectly;" furthermore: "It is indeed certain that new obedience toward God and a new life in righteousness and holiness is begun in this life and perfected in the future life, that it is also necessary for salvation; and so that if one sin against conscience after forgiveness has been obtained, that thus life and salvation be lost." And later Major withdrew to the very same manner of expression.

From this the right judgment of both men and their schools is derived. The sentence: Good works are necessary unto salvation, is intended in the Romish sense as little by Major as by Menius. Against this the first has sufficiently protected himself in his answer to Amsdorf, inasmuch as he expressly declares, that he speaks of good works only as the fruit of justifying faith, "which can as little be without works as the sun without brightness and sheen," and in so far he has been unjustly treated by his opponents through

their charge of Papism. Even so Menius decidedly rejects that proposition in the sphere of justification, but does not entirely condemn it in the sphere of new obedience, although he on his part, because it is ambiguous, prefers not to use it at all and to substitute for it the expression, renewal or *nova obedientia.* The tendency of both, therefore, is not to deny to faith the only justifying power, but to make valid the necessity of renovation and good works springing from faith; they are concerned about the inner, inseparable connection between faith and the new life—and indeed in opposition to a retrogadation and a desuetude of this side of the Christian order of salvation. For Major already says at the close of the sermon on the conversion of Paul: "Such misleaders are plentiful in this time who always cry, 'Faith alone makes just and no works are necessary to attain salvation,'" and more definitely Menius: "There is a party among the protestants, (Antinomians, &c..) who antagonize the article of sanctification in the same degree as the Papists and Anabaptists did the article of justification, as this may also be seen, how all wish to be faithful and Christians and yet so few of them are seen who are directed by the Holy Spirit." In this connection he mentions the "accusations of Osiander although without foundation, as if the preachers taught of justification by faith in such a cold and perverted way, that people could obtain God's grace, forgiveness of sins and eternal life, although they remained without conversion and betterment; therefore, he, Menius, held it to be his duty, in addition to the article of justification also more diligently and zealously to teach the article of sanctification, renovation of the Holy Spirit, or new obedience." And over against this tendency both men are decidedly in the right; it is an evangelical truth which they represent with their school.

But on the other hand, their numerous opponents — and to these belong not only Flacius and the Jenensians, but also the most of the clergy of the Luth. Church — are, in the first place, right in this, that they reject the proposition of Major, because it is the expression for the Romish counter-doctrine, the negation of the protestant principle;

as it reads, it always makes works the co-ordinate condition of justification and salvation; and conceived of otherwise it at least has no meaning any more. For it is a perfect confusion to say once, that good works must follow faith which alone makes just and saves; and then, they are necessary to salvation, because faith, which alone saves, must show itself by good works. Thus the proposition of Major, if it is to have any meaning at all, always falls into the article of justification and alters its clearness, "it is a sour vinegar which spoils the sweet honey taste of the gospel." In this connection it is of right generally rejected, but yet it was not maintained, as we have seen, either by Major nor by Menius.

However, even in the sense held fast by them, it is held objectionable. For the main question — so both themselves very rightly defined the *status controversiae* — the main question was certainly not this: "How the sinner may be saved and what he needs for this, but how the sinner who through faith in Christ has been received into grace and saved, is to conduct himself, that he may remain saved, and not fall again from the state of grace and salvation; what is necessary unto this? "And also in this conception the *sola fide* seems to be endangered. For according to this even though the foundation of justification do not, yet the continuation of the relations founded by it, rests at the same time upon faith and upon new obedience; the salvation of man still has two factors; God's work of grace through Christ for us, and the work of the Spirit in us; trust upon that, and obedience toward this. Faith in the continuation of Christian life surrenders its principal significance not entirely to sanctification, but it is divided with the latter, and by this looses it anyway. Against this co-ordination there was raised at once the most emphatic protest. However interpreted, it will always lead back to Romish errors; it reminds me of the *fides formata* of the Scholastics, it contradicts Scripture, which vindicates both the beginning as well as the continuation and end of salvation unto faith, and it narrows the certainty of promise; *si enim fundamentum salutis aliqua ex parte, quantulacunque ea sit, in nostra opera recumbat,*

incerta erit promissio; it decreases the glory of free grace and thus reacts destructively upon the article of justification. The relation founded upon this would constantly remain the ground of the state of grace; as soon as one also only partly rests salvation upon one's own deeds, one loses Christ and falls from grace. Not only for the beginning, but also for the whole course of Christian life the *nisi propter fidem* retains its full force. — Reference was also made to the practical consequences of that doctrine: It will not permit assailed souls, mourning their sins, to find rest; especially does it deprive him who in his last hour wishes to apprehend Christ, of all comfort, and it confirms, on the other hand, the trust in one's own deeds; the contradiction with Luther is at all events apparent. — With Major fault was found, in addition, for confusing the conceptions. *Justificatio*, and *renovatio*, as well as for the assertion of a *justitia fidei inchoata*, which approaches too nearly to the perfection of the righteousness of Christ which is imputed to us by faith.

With this criticism the error of the designated comprehension is altogether rightly exposed. It lies in this, that in it an essential element of evangelical truth is held one-sidedly and in a manner which is in contradiction with the fundamental principle of Protestantism. This insight prevailed in the Church generally; the doctrine of the necessity of good works and of new obedience unto salvation was even by the Wittenberg school itself declared doubtful and misleading. Melanchthon also rejected it. "Although this proposition is to be held fast; *nova obedientia est necessaria*, yet we do not wish to add these words, *ad salutem*, because this appendix is interpreted in favor of the *meritum*, and the doctrine of grace would be darkened; for this remains true, that man is just before God and the heir of eternal salvation by grace for the Lord Jesus' sake."

B) Hitherto we have only described the one stadium of this controversy. In the second, which is immediately connected with it, the other side of the antithesis, the opposite extreme appears.

Although, indeed, Majors' opponents in general defi-

nitely recognized the necessity of new obedience and of good works as the fruit and evidence of faith, yet by individuals in their midst the inner connection of both faith and works was partly mistaken, and partly the significance of the latter was lessened.

This became evident primarily at the same place at which Major's and Menius' doctrine was rejected, at the so-called Synod at Eisenach, 1556, which touches upon the history of the anti-nomistic controversy. For when to the explanation of the correct proposition: *Sola fides fustificat et salvat in principio, medio et fine*, there was added: "Although it is true that *gratia and donum per gratiam* cannot be separated, but must always be together, yet the gift of the Holy Ghost is not a piece or a part, much less a co-ordinated cause of justification, but it is an appendix, consequence and addition of grace," there evidently lies at the bottom of these latter expressions an entirely external comprehension of the relation between justification and the operations of the grace of the Holy Spirit, a mere consequence of both, which is not less erroneous than that co-ordination. Similar remarks are found elsewhere. Thus says Flacius: "God dwells only in the already justified, but the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is the beginning of renovation; *quare instauratio aut renovatio est prorsus res separata a justificatione;* indeed some one should have made answer to Melanchthon's objection: *Deus non curat opera.*

In the meantime there was no stand made here. The above mentioned Synod had determined that the sentence: Good works are necessary to salvation is correct in the sphere of the law *abstractive* or *de idea*, and therefore (though misleading) it might be tolerated. Against this Amsdorf and with him several Erfurt and Nordhaeuser clergyman raised, as we have seen above, the most determined opposition: "The law, even considered in itself, has no reference to the salvation of man, it contains no promises of eternal life, —even not then when it is fulfilled perfectly. Its office is solely to uncover, punish and condemn sin; it cannot also be said that man through obedience to the law, or through

good works, could ever have attained salvation. The passage of Holy Writ 'This do and thou shalt live,' refers only to the outer, earthly life. With this they did not intend by any means to deny the necessity of good works; they affirmed it most decidedly, but thus that they would have everything legal excluded from this necessity." Not because God commands them in the law, but solely as the fruits of faith, as a free expression of love and gratitude for the grace received are they necessary, *ad testificandam remissionem debiti gratuitam*—and to denote this relation of freedom they did not, in short, think the expressions, *necessitas* and *meritum*, really fit; they saw therein a legal compulsion. Several on this account rejected them entirely, yes, a few went so far as to assert: "A man could retain true faith, even though he sinned against the law wilfully and with better knowledge."

But the climax in this Antinomianism was reached in the notorious proposition of old Amsdorf: That good works are detrimental to salvation (1559); of course, he wishes thereby only to say, that they are detrimental in as far as they are considered meritorious, or, in as far as our trust is based upon them. And only in this sense had the Nordhaeuser clergy used the sentence; they are concerned about the difference between faith and works, and fruits of faith and deeds of the law, but the difference results in an entire separation and thereby in the lowering of works.

We may then say of this whole course that it represents an element of evangelical truth, yet it holds it so one-sidedly that the connection with the rest is lost, and thus it stands in contradiction with the churchly doctrine, which recognizes both elements in their essential unity. And this is its untruth and its wrong.

At once, from all sides, this position was most emphatically gainsaid. The Witttenberg school antagonized it furiously and especially to Melanchthon belongs the merit of having aided essentially in its overthrow. He called attention to its contradiction to Scripture and to the danger to morals, to the libertinism which lies in it; *est igitur barbarica*

impietas fingere, non esse necessarium hanc obedientiam, sed esse concessam licentiam omittendi eam; he calls it an open lie, an open blasphemy. On the contrary he emphasizes in the strongest terms the necessity of new obedience and of good works: "Therefore this proposition must be maintained," he cries out, "it is and remains eternal truth and may not even be destroyed by a devil." This necessity he then defines more closely partly as an inner one, founded upon the essence of justifying faith, partly as a *necessitas ordinis* as a *debitum.*

In the first connection he, in opposition to that external consequentialness, emphasizes that justification cannot exist without conversion, which in itself already is an operation of the Holy Ghost and, therefore, *eo ipso* includes the beginning of renovation, that faith in its nature kindles a new light and life in the heart, consequently is never without inner fruits, which must be followed by outer fruits; "the two propositions, *sola fide justificamur* and *fides non est sola,* are equally true and to be held fast in the same manner."

In the other connection he says: Good works, or new obedience, are necessary on account of divine order, because the rational creature owes God obedience, for this it was created and is now regenerated, that it might be conformed to Him, as the Apostle says: *debitores sumus,* "and protects this *debitum* against the Antinomian interpretation; *insulsitatis est, fingere, haec vocabula necessitatem et debitum sifinificare terrore extortum, sed ordinem divinum et immotum in Deo ignificat;* it by no means is left to the good pleasure of the believer, whether he will render this new obedience or not; it is his holy duty; but he discharges it not from compulsion, but driven by love. With this Melanchthon is well satisfied, that one do not add *ad salutem,* which is ambiguous and could easily lead to the idea of a meritoriousness of works; for this interpretation is to be avoided: good works are the merit of salvation and faith and trust must rest securely alone upon the Lord Jesus, that we certainly through Him alone, *propter seum et per eum,* have forgiveness of sins,

imputation of righteousness, Holy Spirit and an inheritance of eternal life. This foundation is certain." Thus Melanchthon and in the same way, yea, almost in the same words, his school afterwards unfolded these relations and presented them in open writings. In this it is evidently right over against the errors which it antagonizes; and also in this, that it desires to have understood under good works, not merely some outward acts, but the whole inner and outer life — activity of faith.

Here one dare not overlook, that also those of the strictly Lutheran tendency, or as they are pleased to call them, the Flacians, antagonize these errors, yea first of all antagonized them. For yet in the year 1556 Flacius, Gallus, especially J. Moerlin, afterwards Chemnitz and many others arose against those of Erfurt, and in their polemics they made prominent besides the ethical, also the dogmatical consequences, to which that manner of teaching leads, but in such a way that they did not fail to recognize the truth in it: *Postremo etiam dicendum est de illa propositione: bona opera esse perniciosa ad salutem. Quando enim nude et truncatim ita ponitur, sicut, simpliciter non est falsa, sed secundum quid, ita simpliciter non est vera, sed secundum aliquid. Non est antem in ecclesia ludendum hujusmodi ambigius paradoxis, quae longa circuitione, operosa et sollicita interpretatione vix possunt ita declarari, ut aures piae non offendantur.* The necessity of new obedience as a fruit of faith, they recognize no less than the Wittenbergers and developed it from the nature of faith; they only lay the greater stress upon this, that this necessity is not external, but the inner and free motion of the heart regenerated by faith, and stronger than those they reject every co-operation of works to justification and salvation.

This was the state of affairs about the year 1570. It is apparent, that, notwithstanding the existing differences, a consensus in the essential point was developed. There was a mutual agreement in the fundamental principle, the extremes which appeared on both sides were dropped, on the one hand the necessity of good works is recognized, while on the other hand the *necessitas ad salutem* is dropped.

What now does the Formula of Concord? In the first place it sums up the general truths upon which both parts are agreed, and then it rejects the sentence of Major of the necessity of good works to salvation, as well as that of Amsdorf of their detrimentalness; the former, because and in so far as it is drawn into the article of justification, it destroys the fundamental doctrine *de sola fide justificante;* the latter, because considered in itself it is offensive and false, and weakens discipline and honorableness; then it rejects, reaching deeper, the notion that faith and received righteousness can exist together with voluntary sins, or that it cannot be lost by bad works (the Antinomians), as well as the opinion that faith apprehends the beginning of righteousness and salvation, but after this hands over its office to works, thus that these henceforth must sustain faith, the received righteousness and salvation (Menius),—and on the contrary sets up the two positive propositions: 1. That faith is the proper and only means through which righteousness and salvation are not only received, but also are sustained by God (*fides initium, medium et finis salutis*); 2. That good works necessarily ought to follow faith and justification; item, that good works are the necessary fruits of faith, which without them is a dead faith, or a mere delusion. While it the more closely explains this necessity, it seeks to unite the two factors, necessitas and libertas,—and this was the main point around which the controversy at last revolved. The necessity of good works, it says, rests primarily upon the eternal, divine will, (*ordo divinus, mandatum div.*) which obligates all men, but especially the believing, to walk in good works, and in so far it certainly does not stand in the good pleasure of the regenerated whether he will act *bene* or *male, quando ipsi visum voluerit;* on the other hand, however, this *necessitas* is no legal compulsion, this obedience is not forced, for God does not desire such external works, but they shall be done willingly (*libero spiritu*) by those whom the Son of God has made free. The contrariety of coaction and wilfulness will not bear an application to this relation, but the question is concerning a necessity which is at the same time liberty; and this is

that which is granted by the gospel. *Epit. IV. Sol. Declar. IV. de bonis operibus.*

With these positions then the Formula of Concord has truly hit the right middle between the divergent directions. But do they correspond to the fundamental principle of the Church, to the contents of its older confessions? They are, in fact, nothing else but the simple application of Art. IV., VI., XX. of the Augustana, and Sec. III. of the Apology to the antithesis in question, just as they do not claim to be anything else. The new matter in them is only twofold; namely, the more precise determining concerning the necessity of good works, in virtue of divine order—and this is founded in the *propter voluntatem Dei* of the Apology; then also the combination of the two factors *necessitas* and *libertas* —and this is the necessary consequence of the relation of the propositions just cited to the others: *Fide corda renovantur et induunt novos motus, fides regenerat nos et adfert spiritum* s.) *impossibile est dilectionem divellere a fide;* for both sentences then only contain no contradiction, when that necessity is at the same time freedom. If this determination goes beyond the older confessions, it is only an advance and, one indeed, that is consistent and true.

Also in the article *de bonis operibus* one cannot, therefore, fault the Formula of Concord.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VIII. DECEMBER, 1888. No. 6.

DISCIPLINE COMMENDED.

"A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye love one another." John 13, 34. In nothing is the love of Christ so characteristically distinctive as in this that it is a love for the sinner to the sinner's salvation—a merciful and saving love. "A bruised reed shall He not break, and the smoking flax shall He not quench,"—is the mark set of old on Him who was sent to save His people from their sins. Matt. 12, 20. Isa. 42, 3; 61, 1; and Ezek. 34, 16. And when we, who have been saved, in the strength of the love saving us and after its pattern love one another, we can, in reference to our fellowmen, in nothing become so peculiarly Christlike as we do in the endeavor to stand by one another in the battle against sin and for righteousness. In this sense St. Paul writes: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye, which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." Gal. 6, 1. 2. To sympathize with a brother who has allowed himself to be overcome of sin and thus burdened his conscience, and to lift up such an one is here by the apostle singled out and set forward as the chief element in "the law of Christ,"

if not as its very substance. Nor is this last saying too much inasmuch as the work of restoration includes the ministering of strength to the fallen one whereby he may be able to stand after he has been raised up, and to stand with greater firmness than before. Viewed thus, the reproof and correction of a brother in trespass embraces the positive act of edification with a view to his future security; and hence it may well be said that to bear kindly with an erring and fallen brother and to labor in meekness and with patience in order to reclaim him, is to fulfill "the law of Christ."

This same service of love is enjoined by our Lord Himself when He says: "—if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother." Matt. 18, 15. etc. And St. James commends it when he writes: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth"—comp. chap. 1, 18.—"and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins." Chap. 5, 19. 20. To him, therefore, whose labor in this field of Christian activity is crowned with success, Christ says: "Thou hast gained a brother;" and here the great fact that a soul is saved from death is pressed upon the consciousness of the happy one that has been instrumental in the saving work. "Let him know;" yes, let every one know and think of it: a soul saved from death and a brother gained! What reward could be greater?

Since then the virtue of brotherly correction and strengthening consists in that supreme love which is the fulfillment of the law of Christ, and since the prize held out to it is the salvation of a brother's soul, there is certainly not found within the second table of the law a service that

commends itself more highly than this; nor dare we become remiss in performing it so long as there is manifest among us any yielding whatsoever to the temptations of sin.

But how do things stand among us in this regard? in our works of mercy, what attention is given to this one, the highest of all? One thing is certain: the devil has lost none of his prowess and power, the deceitfulness of sin is as strong and the flesh is found as weak as ever; every appearance and every assurance to the contrary notwithstanding, the old enemy and destroyer of souls is not a whit less bitter and aggressive now than he was in times that are past, nor are we at all sure that his ravages among God's people have abated in anything. Be this as it may, the question is how, while we are joined in battle with him, do we attend to our wounded? It is said in praise of modern warfare that its cruelty has been mitigated and its destructiveness lessened by the introduction of the litter, the ambulance, the physician and the nurse; and if humanity has become thus considerate of the bodily life and well-being of such as have put themselves under its banner, must it be said of christianity that it shows itself less merciful to a wounded soul, and a Christian's soul at that?

Let us confess it—and do so in the hope that an upright and open confession of our shortcoming may lead to our betterment—, it is a matter of deep regret that the supreme worth of mutual uplifting and establishment is not more highly and more generally appreciated in the Church, and that in consequence the work itself is a much neglected one. It would seem that both in the patient and among his friends bodily ills awaken a deeper alarm than do the spiritual; and that, as a rule, some Christians are ready to do and to endure more for the health of their bodies than

for the health of their souls. One of the chief ends of Christian association is that through its agency the individual may obtain help and strength against the dread power of sin. But how many people nowadays desire a watch over their souls by others, and apply for membership in the church in order to secure the benefits of such a supervision over themselves? And if one who is sensible of his own infirmity should really enter the church in the hope that both his brethren and the brotherhood will constitute a watch and help for him, is he seen to find his expectations realized? Of course, to incur the necessity of reproof and correction is the result of one's own folly, and is always more or less a matter of shame; but he makes full the measure of his folly and shame who, when in need of it, refuses the chastenings of the Lord and rejects His servants that come to administer it. And of such Christians and church members we have many. They come to us and move among us with the understanding, on their part, to be let alone; and little as they expect to be dealt with for their foibles and faults, no more and no better will they deal with others; the result is that the "brotherly admonition" enjoined by Scripture is neglected, and—though the wolves are as yet kept out, the foxes are allowed free play.

As may be seen from the order laid down for this service in Matt. 18, the unofficial is the basis of the official endeavor to rescue a soul from sin and death or of church discipline proper; and hence it stands to reason that where the former is fallen into neglect, the latter is not likely to receive any better attention. Not only is church discipline in many cases rendered impossible for the simple reason that the private admonition which should precede it does not take place, but there are other considerations coming into play here and that disparage the good work.

It is indeed manifest to all, for example, that a brother overtaken in trespass if not restored is lost, and that a soul which has erred from the truth of life becomes a forfeit to eternal death unless it be converted; but then—and thus the idle bystanders excuse themselves—will the one submit to reproof and the other to correction? will not their own better judgment and nature assert themselves by and by? will not time and a kind Providence come to the rescue? and why should just I run the risk of losing the "good will" of a friend and go to so much trouble besides? To doubts and fears and pretenses and hesitations such as these, all of which are unworthy of the Christian and church member and hinder him from performing a most sacred duty, there comes to the churches and their representatives temptations of another sort; or it may be more correct to say that the same adverse influences operate here as there, only in another plane, on a wider scale and in different bearings. Here there is the insinuating charm of a large, or a wealthy, or an aristocratic membership; and congregations thus bewitched are sure to be slow to do what may possibly injure the church of their fancy. Under such circumstances is the poor minister especially tempted; feeling that his efficiency and usefulness are measured in view of the crowds he can draw and of the social standing and influence he can lift his church to in the community, it goes doubly hard with him to take the initiative in and do his part of the good work. With the ill-will of his parishioners before him in the prospective, and knowing that his bread is buttered by them more in accordance with their feelings than with his own faithfulness, he certainly needs the strong grace of God to conquer the promptings of his flesh and to quit himself like a man in the hour of need. Discipline,

even under more favorable circumstances, quite often turns out to be a thankless task. Like that of a physician, it is in itself a disagreeable duty at any time; for sin is an ugly sore, and of all patients the sinner is most likely to show himself the most peevish and touchy, not to say rebellious and obstinate. Add to this that the man's friends, carried away with a false shame or sympathy, place obstacles of every sort in the healer's way, and then that those who should be the latter's counselors and assistants play the worst part of all, is it a wonder that the good work languishes here and there and that the dread reaper of sin is gathering in a plentiful harvest?

When such a state of affairs has set in then the few that would be faithful should do their utmost to procure a hearing for the earnest monitions and the sweet promises of God's Word in reference to this Work of mercy; and seeing that others are negligent and criminally idle they should hold themselves ready to do each one the work of ten, if need be, rather than see a brother's soul go to perdition. And this all the more because it will be found that those who do more to hinder than to help the fallen one are apt to set themselves up as his judges, but only to make sure of his reprobation! Such heartless treatment of one another the Apostle St. John must have observed already among the Christians of his time; for he writes: "This is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another; not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother." 1 John 3, 11. 12. Love one another, not as Cain who considered it an imposition that he should be his brother's keeper, and then slew him because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous: how sad that it should ever become necessary so to address a people born of God.

See verse 9. But it is a necessity brought on by the tongue of betrayal, of unrighteous judgment and of slander in the mouths of people professing to be Christians, and the blood of whose victims, like Abel's, cries to heaven.

When a brother is overtaken in trespass, "the right thing to do is as Luther says in his explanation of the Eighth commandment, *Cat. Major* —" to follow the order laid down by Christ in Matt. 18: 'Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone.' Then the precious doctrine is urged upon thee to govern well thy tongue, and which thou wilt do well to observe to avoid thy tongue's abuse. Heed it so that thou mayest not be quick to publish thy neighbor's fault and to raise reports injurious to him; but rather that thou mayest exhort him in private and he amend his ways. Then too, should another report to thee what this or that one has done amiss, him also direct to go and reprove the one whose offence he hath witnessed; but if he will not, bid him hold his tongue. . . . So to do is to act in a truly brotherly manner; sin is rebuked, evil is restrained, and thy neighbor's good name remains unsullied. Even as Christ says: 'If he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother.' And then hast thou accomplished a great and noble work; or dost thou esteem it a small matter to gain a brother? Let all the monks and holy orders step forward with all their good works put together, and see whether they can lay claim to the honor that" — with all their good works — "they have gained a brother."

Following these words, Luther proceeds to discuss the merit and mode of public discipline when such may become necessary. Concerning this it may suffice for the present to state what is said in the Smalkald Articles, to-wit: "The

Major ex-communication, as the pope calls it, we hold to be a purely civil punishment, and something with which as the servants of the Church have nothing to do. But the Minor, that is the true Christian ex-communication consists in this, that manifest and obstinate sinners be not allowed to partake of the communion nor be admitted to the fellowship of the Church in any other way until they shall have reformed and abstain from sin." Mueller p. 323. See also the Apology, Art. IX, or Mueller p. 165, § 62.

But whilst the Scriptures and the Confessions of our Church thus speak of discipline in the strongest terms of commendation, they have added words of warning also. And not without good reason; for erroneous notions on this subject have been entertained from the beginning, and whenever such was the case more harm than good was done the cause which discipline is intended to further.

The first restriction which the Scriptures put upon us in the exercise of discipline, is contained in the parable of the "man which sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat. "Matt. 13, 24–30 and 36–43. The central and chief point of this parable evidently lies in the question of the servants. "Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up?" And in the answer of the husbandman, "Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn." Let both grow together until the harvest — these words seem to say that "the children of the wicked one" are to be let alone and allowed to live in fellowship with "the children of the kingdom." But such can-

not be their meaning; for then the Lord would contradict Himself and one scripture annul another, since such an interpretation stands in direct opposition to Matt. 18, 15–18, and 1 Cor. 5, 1–7.

To harmonize the Lord's injunction given here with His teachings in other places and with apostolic practice as well, some have understood "the tares" to mean the hypocrites in the Church, so that the lesson intended to be inculcated is: against the hypocritical, because they cannot be known with certainty, no disciplinary proceedings are to be instituted by the Church. What has led to this interpretation is the use of the word ζιζάνιον = darnel or a wheat-like grass; but opposed to the use of this word as the key to the parable's explanation stands the plain statement that "the tares appeared" — and so appeared that the servants saw them and at first sight knew them to be tares. Nor does this interpretation accord with the one given by the Lord Himself. "The tares" according to His statement are "the children of the wicked one" and "all things that offend and they that do iniquity." There is here not the least intimation that "the tares" among the wheat are intended to symbolize the hypocritical in the Church of Christ.

More satisfactory than the foregoing is the explanation based on the words, "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one," and its followers say that the people of the world are here contemplated as divided into the godly on the one hand and the wicked on the other, and that it is the purport of the parable to teach that the former in their warfare against the latter are not to have resort to the weapons of the flesh. True as this is in itself and implied as it may be in the lesson here taught, it can not be said that this is the real and full scope of the parable.

When the Lord says that "the Kingdom of Heaven is likened unto a man who sowed good seed in his field," the field, (no less than the man and his sowing of good seed), is placed in apposition to the kingdom of Heaven; this is the case to such an extent at least, that "the world" can not be said to be one thing and "the Kingdom of Heaven" another, and one that is not only completely separate from but that stands opposed to the former. "The world" as "the field" of the Divine Sower and in which "the blade" springs up and brings forth fruit, is mankind under the influence of the divine Word; and in this view of it is the world of mankind here spoken of as the Kingdom of Heaven. But now within this field there is wheat and there are tares; or in other words: within the Kingdom of Heaven as here contemplated there are the children of the Kingdom and there are children of the wicked one. A sharp distinction is made between the two, but no state of separation is said to exist between them; on the contrary, the wheat and the tares are presented as growing together in the same field — the real children of the Kingdom of Heaven and the children of the wicked one are presented as mingled together; — and therefore the servants' query: Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? does not refer to any tares without but to the tares that are within "the field." What shall be done with the wicked that appear among and mingle with the godly from time to time? this we take to be the real scope of the text; and that we are correct in this view of the parable is corroborated by the Lord's explanation of the husbandman's answer to the inquiring servants: "The Son of Man shall send forth His Angels, and they shall gather *out of His Kingdom*, all things that offend, and them which do iniquity." But if the question pertains to the

treatment of the wicked in the church, then is the subject of church discipline invalid; and it remains for us to see what the Lord would have us learn from the man of the parable.

In the first place, from the husbandman's direction, "Let both grow together," and from the Lord's own comment upon it, we learn that the Church of Christ shall to the end of time embrace within its external organization "things that offend, and them which do iniquity." In the Church there shall be always such as are not of it; and they that are of it shall always be such as have sins to contend with, sins to repent of, sins to be forgiven, and sins to lay aside. 1 John 1, 8–10; Heb. 12, 1; etc. That any one who is in the Church be not of it also, is contrary to the will of God; so too is it contrary to His will that those who are of it "love sin;" but in His wisdom and mercy He wills his Church on earth to be no better than it can be made by the power of His Word in the hands of man. Unless the Word of grace can check them, "the tares" are to grow up with "the wheat;" that the Word does not entirely succeed in this its gracious appointment, is the devil's doing — "an enemy hath done this." The result is, an imperfect church, — imperfect in this that all "its members" are not Christians, — and that such as are, are not perfect —; and that the Church on earth be and remain what it is to the end of time, this is, within the restrictions set forth, the will of God. "Till the day of judgment the Church visible is to include such as are not members of the Church invisible and as do not belong to the Kingdom that is to be. To effect a (complete) sepation between them is the prerogative not of man but of the Judge. This relation or state of things however is meant to prevail only in general, so that the ex-communication and

the reinstatement of individuals are not to be interfered with. As regards the individuals there is the possibility — though the parable does not set it forth — "*ut qui hodie sunt zizania, cras sint frumentum! Augustin.*" *Meyer's Kom. pro loco.* The conclusion is that church discipline, though it is to labor in that direction, is not designed to bring about a state of the Church including Saints only. To do this, powers are necessary such as God has not given to man.

Yet this is not all that can be learned from the parable touching our subject; for, in the second place, it is suggestive of thoughts that bear on the matter in hand even more directly than the one just had under consideration. The servants' question, "Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up?" betrays an inconsiderate zeal which those who are startled at the presence of tares in the wheat-field of their Lord will do well to beware of. Tares in the economy of nature may be useless, and fit only to be gathered up and burned; and yet again they may not be entirely useless; but be this as it may, that the first and only thought on sight of them is one of destruction is not the prompting of wisdom. Least of all is this the case within the economy of grace; for here, as Augustine says, what are "tares" to-day may be "wheat" to-morrow. Wherefore, on beholding a "man of sin," even if it be in "holy places," our hearts should be aroused to thoughtful sympathy; and then, seeing in the sinner a possible saint, we should put forth our best efforts not to kill but to cure the man.

The unwisdom of these over-zealous servants is farther revealed in this that they gave no thought to the injury they might do "the wheat" while attempting to gather up "the tares," as they proposed. Hence the husbandman's sharp interdiction and timely reminder: "Nay; lest while

ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them." As the rootlets of the tares are at times so intertwined with those of the wheat that neither can be "gathered up" without the other; in like manner are "the children of the wicked one" now and then found intermixed with "the children of the kingdom" and are the ties between them such that it is far better to suffer the evil of the mixture than to risk the dangers of a separation. "Let both grow together"—if it be God's will—"until the harvest." God does not want us to do what is the office of "His angels." In short, rather than pull up "the wheat" with them, let "the tares" grow. But mark the limit that is implied: the growth, the increase, the safety, the ripening of wheat, in a word, an abundant harvest of fine wheat is what the husbandman aims at; and this as the one end of his business governs him in all his actions; therefore, *if allowing the tares to grow is seen to do greater injury to the wheat than would their gathering up, then let the servants set themselves to weeding as best they can with the implements of their Master's furnishing.*

Other directions of a more or less restrictive character for such as would exercise discipline, may be gathered from Matt. 7, 1–5; and of these we will note but two. The one pertains to the standard of measurement; the other to the right preparation for the work. Concerning the former the Lord says: "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." But now, by what judgment do we desire God to take account of us, and admit us to favor and fellowship with Himself? Certainly not by that of stern justice, and by inquiry into our personal worth and merit; for if so, then shall not one of us be able to stand before Him; as sinful and as workers

of iniquity the sentence of condemnation must be passed on us all. No, as we expect to be judged by mercy, by mercy alone, and by mercy wondrously great, so are we to take account of a brother for his short-comings and sins. "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful:" and on no occasion is there greater need of a merciful heart, than when we are called to deal with a sinner for purposes of redemption.

The Lord continues: "And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?" If upright and merciful in heart, we will not be of a fault-finding spirit nor of a meddlesome disposition. Withal that, this is not to render us blind and indifferent to our brother's sin, even when it is a small one; rather is a sincere and deep concern for his welfare to sharpen our sight to everything that may bring woe to his soul and make us all the more anxious to keep it out of harm's way;—but our own soul first: "first cast out the beam of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." If we do not see the importance of our own soul's chastening and are unwilling to chasten ourselves, we are hardly fitted to perform that office on others.

If now we turn to the Confessions of our Church, we find them in full accord with the Scriptures as to the limitations they put upon discipline. By their rejection of the "major excommunication"—noted above—they emphatically declare themselves opposed to all measures of violence as employed by and in behalf of the Church. "The pastoral office"—says the Augustana—"is, according to divine right, the authority; to preach the Gospel; to forgive sin; to judge the doctrine; to condemn doctrines contrary to the Gospel;

and to excommunicate the godless, whose impiety has become manifest without any resort to human power but alone to the Word of God." Mueller, p. 64 Moreover, they reject as erroneous the opinions, first, "that that is not a true Christian congregation or church in which sinners are yet found;"—Form. Con. Mueller, p. 727;—and secondly, "that that is no true Christian congregation in which public excommunication does not take place, or in which a well-ordered process of banning is not in vogue." Ibid; Mueller p. 729.

That these negations are substantially in entire agreement with the teachings of Scripture already set forth a little reflection will suffice to show; there is therefore no necessity of discussing their bearing on discipline, since it would only lead to a repetition of what has already been said. There is only one question which we feel ourselves constrained to ask here, to wit: are not the parable of Matthew 13 and the last named *Rejectio* of the Formula of Concord misapprehended among us to the disparagement of Christian discipline? True, both are directed against certain perversions, excesses and abuses that may, and that do at times, attach themselves to this sacred duty both in doctrine and in practice; but surely not a word is said in either whereby the Lord's injunction contained in Matthew 18 is in the least annulled; nor is anything said to suppress our zeal in this work of mercy, or that might be adduced in excuse for any faithlessness therein. For example, if church discipline is not an essential mark of the church, if the latter *can* exist without recourse to the former, is that any evidence that discipline is of little importance to a congregation, and is that something for us to fall back on as a bed of ease to a guilty conscience? If not its existence, certainly the integ-

rity and prosperity of a Christian congregation depend largely on a faithful discharge of this duty. To neglect it is to neglect a soul-saving work.

Let us commend Christian discipline to our people in our preaching so that it may again commend itself in its practice to both God and man. C. H. L. S.

CONSCIENCE.

BY PROF. J. M. HANTZ.

The responsibility of man is admitted by common consent. Should it in theory be desired, it must, on the basis of order and government, be in practice admitted. Practical non-responsibility would produce a chaos destructive to the interests of mankind. Responsibility is destructive of man. It cannot, therefore, be affirmed of him merely because his actions contribute to the sum of good and of evil in the world. Things inanimate and irrational, which, by common consent, are not responsible, confer benefits and inflict injuries upon mankind. The rain and sunshine maturing the fruits of the earth, are beneficial; famine and pestilence, sweeping thousands to the grave and filling all with consternation, are evils. Nevertheless they are not responsible. One man is torn to pieces by a lion, and another man has a dagger plunged into his heart by his brother man. In each case the consequence is the same — death. But while we characterize the animal as dangerous and hurtful, we declare the man to be not only dangerous and hurtful, but also criminal. Since man's conduct may in common with other things, be beneficial or injurious, it follows, that, in the

mere results or tendencies of his actions, there cannot be that which invests him with his distinctive responsibility. *That* must spring from something in the man himself, which is non-existent in his irresponsible co-contributors to the sum of good and evil in the world. What, then, is it in man himself which distinguishes him from all other agencies, and stamps upon his nature the attribute of responsibility? It is, first, the possession of will, in virtue of which man is the cause of his own actions. If this power of will as a proper cause of actions be denied, and their cause be traced to something external to that will, then man ceases to be responsible, because these actions occur in him, like motion in space, only as the sphere of their manifestation. The affirmation of man's responsibility rests upon the assumption that he is the real author or proper cause of his actions. This cannot be false unless the common consciousness and verdict of mankind are a lie, when they assert that whenever an action is beyond the limits, or exists in spite, of man's power or will, he is not responsible. But, secondly, granting that man, as the possessor of will, is the efficient cause of his own actions, it is requisite to his responsibility that there exist a rule or law according to which he is bound to exercise his causative power of will, and that he be able to apprehend it. Without such a rule or law apprehended, the will would be unconditioned, and, as a mere causative energy, would be without guidance and obligation to exert itself in one way rather than in another. If the will, as a free cause, did not come under a recognized law, its acts could not in their nature be determined. Where no law is, there can neither be transgression nor obedience, and therefore no responsibility. But while the law or rule which conditions the will, and invests it as the cause of ac-

tions with responsibility, requires to be imperative, it must not be necessitating. The instincts of inferior animals may be regarded as law according to which their actions are performed, and the end of their existence secured; but, in their nature, instincts are necessitating, and, therefore, their subjects are irresponsible. In man's case, the law or rule according to which his will, as a cause, is to act, contains not the necessity of "must be," but the imperative of "ought to be;" and therefore, by the moral constitution of his nature, and by the correlated moral law, man occupies a position freely to fulfill or violate his apprehended obligations. In our estimation, the power to do, and the power to apprehend what we ought to do, underlie the idea of man's responsibility. If either the one or the other can be proved non-existent, so can human responsibility.

In this article we propose to examine the mental power which recognizes what we, as causes, ought to do. We assume that a law does exist according to which man ought to act, — that its formula is "thou shalt do that which is right," — and that conscience is the mental power or faculty which apprehends and responds to that imperative law. Here two distinct, yet intimately related, questions present themselves. What is the nature and foundation of rectitude? and what is the nature of the mental power by which rectitude is known? As we restrict ourselves to the latter question, the former will come under consideration only in so far as it is necessary to elucidate the latter. Conscience, like our other powers of mind, is known by us through our consciousness of its phenomena, and, therefore, to these we invite attention.

The idea or notion of right and wrong is involved in the operation of conscience. There exists in every sane

mind the notion of rectitude and its opposite. If any man be incapable of attaining the notion of right and wrong, we should regard him as destitute of conscience and of unsound mind. The distinction between right and wrong is seen to be necessary; for just as the same thing cannot be thought true and false at the same time, so the same thing cannot, at the same time, be thought right and wrong. Not only are right and wrong immutably distinct; they are, also, in thought immutably permanent. Let a man try ever so much to think them wrong, and conceive them to be non-existent and he finds that they exist, and, under given conditions, must exist forever. He may now regard that as wrong which he once esteemed to be right; yet, that change of opinion rests on the permanent conviction that there is a right and a wrong. One man may affirm, and another may deny, that a thing is right; but their discussion acknowledges the distinction. They dispute about the particular application of an admitted general principle. In like manner one nation may observe certain customs as right, which another condemns as wrong. Still the difference of opinion as to the specific application of the general principle, admits its existence. Amid all uncertainties and errors in its relation to particular cases, the notion of right and wrong is by all admitted to be the standard by which all human acts, manners, and customs ought to be tested, and declared to be virtuous or vicious, praiseworthy or criminal. Right and wrong, like true and false, are involved in every sound mind, and are, in thought, contradictions.

The notion of right appears to us to be simple and ultimate, and, therefore, not admitting of logical definition. All that we can do is to use verbal equivalents, and to point out the conditions requisite to the existence of the notion

in the mind. We may say that right is the agreement, and wrong the non-agreement, of voluntary actions with that which exists. But if any one should ask what is that "agreement?" our reply is, It is that which we call "right." If a man does not know from the dictionary of his consciousness what is meant by the term right, his case is as hopeless as that of the blind, as to what is meant by the term "red." In the verbal definition we have just given there is this advantage, that it brings into view the conditions required for the existence of the notion of right and wrong. On the one hand, it presents the intelligence apprehending that which exists, and on the other, the consciousness of voluntary actions. If the mind be in total ignorance concerning what exists, it is evident that the notion of right and wrong cannot exist. Before we can determine what is right and wrong, we require to know not only the nature and relation of the object on which the actions terminate, but also the nature and relations of the agent whence they originate. But when the intelligence has attained the truth concerning that which exists, and when the will produces actions, then these actions must either be in accordance with, or in contradiction of, or indifferent to, that which the intelligence affirms as really existing. The notion of right and wrong, therefore, seems to us to be the intuitive discernment of the relation of agreement or non-agreement subsisting between the voluntary acts of will, and that which the intelligence apprehends as really existing. Right and wrong have not respect to the real or supposed truths of the intelligence and the acts of the will separately, but to them both conjointly, and express the relation of the one to the other. Supposing, then, that the intelligence affirms that certain things are true, and that the question arises, what acts of will agree or disagree

with them? how shall that question be answered? By reason. Reason, as that power of mind, which takes cognizance of relations, at once, and intuitively, as the eye sees color, discerns those acts of will which accord with, or contradict, the admitted facts and truths; that is, reason points out those voluntary actions which, in the circumstances, are what we call right or wrong. We thus derive our notion of right and wrong from the exercise of reason, as that power of mind which knows relations, and therefore conscience has reason for one of its constituents.

The view we have given is confirmed by the fact, that we ascribe false decisions as to what is right and wrong, not to a defect in conscience itself, but to incompetent knowledge of that which really exists. When we speak of an unenlightened conscience, we mean one which has not, as the ground of its decisions, adequate information concerning the nature, relations, and circumstances of man. To secure a proper decision by conscience, we aim at furnishing the intelligence with facts and truths, being certain that a just sentence will be given on the case as submitted. The province of conscience is to point out the relation of right and wrong subsisting between admitted facts and truths, and acts of will. If the intelligence is in error then the decision of conscience though in reality wrong is, according to the representation, correct. Hence the objection is powerless, which says that "conscience is without value and unworthy of confidence, inasmuch as it may hold that to be wrong which it formerly considered right; and inasmuch as what one man's conscience affirms to be right, another's condemns as wrong." The whole force of the objection lies in a total mistake concerning the province and function of conscience. It assumes that conscience, to be of use, must possess perfect

knowledge; whereas, it is the function of the intelligence in general to search out and attain truth, and that of conscience to determine the relation of the acts of will to that truth. The intelligence acts the part of a witness, giving evidence concerning what really exists; conscience, like the judge on his bench, accepts the evidence as correct, and, accordingly, pronounces a just sentence upon the related acts of will. We affirm that conscience always gives a proper decision according to the representation set before it. The judge who has heard the evidence of false witnesses, and acquits the criminal, is not chargeable with giving a wrong sentence; for he knows nothing apart from the evidence, and his decision is what the evidence, though not what the reality, demands. So conscience may receive from the intelligence false evidence; and by giving a sentence in harmony with the false evidence received, it may be inconsistent with the reality. By this principle we can easily explain all those aberrations in the moral judgments of mankind. If it be said that the conscience of the Thugs of India sanctions murder as right, we answer, that it is not murder in itself, but the service of an acknowledged Deity, which the Thug's conscience commends. How is the case represented? Kaln, the goddess of distinction, is pleased with the murder of human victims in her service, and the spirit of the victim passes immediately into Paradise, and the blessing of the Deity rests upon her bloody priest. When the murder is represented as something acceptable to an acknowledged Deity, instantaneously giving felicity to the victim and securing benefits to those who perform the service, then conscience must affirm that it is right to do that which pleases the Deity and is advantageous to the victim, and to those who offer him. To change the decision of con-

science in the Thug, it is necessary to impart knowledge concerning the nature of man and his relations to the true God; and as soon as the intellect is properly enlightened, conscience will give a just decision. Having indicated the principle that conscience always gives a correct sentence according to the knowledge possessed, and the accepted evidence concerning what exists, and that the mistakes of conscience arise not from a defect in itself, but from the antecedent errors and misapprehensions of the intelligence, we leave it with our readers to apply the principle to particular instances of moral judgments, which are, in reality, false.

From the preceding remarks it will be observed that we regard the admitted truths of the intelligence as the próximate standard of right and wrong. The will is simply the cause of actions, and, in itself, is indifferent to the actions it produces. There must, therefore, be, external to the will, a fixed term by which the moral quality of its acts may be ascertained. In all positive decisions of reason concerning the relation existing between two or more things, one of the terms must possess certitude. If both, or all the terms, are uncertain, so must be the decision. In the present case the point to be determined is, that a given action is right or wrong. The action is, by hypothesis, in its nature uncertain, and, therefore, some fixed term is requisite by which its nature may be determined. Where can that be found but in the admitted truths of the intelligence? Hence, as a matter of experience, it is to the admitted truths of man's nature, relations, and circumstances, that all acts of will, customs, and laws are brought, and as they harmonize with, or contradict, these truths, they are determined to be right or wrong.

When we examine the contents of the intelligence, we

will find them ultimately comprehended under two great classes. First,—truths which are absolute, which cannot be conceived non-existent, and the apprehension of which is involved in the exercise of rational thought; for example, whatever begins to be must have a cause, and a thing cannot be and not be at the same time, etc. Such truths are independent of will, and are logically antecedent to the actions of all will. Secondly,—truths which are relative, which can be conceived non-existent, and which appear in the established constitution of the created universe. Truths of this class are dependent on will, and exist only on the supposition that the present constitution of things, with its necessary relations of part to part, and of the whole to the will which established it, continues. Thus all truth is either truth which IS, and IS independently of any act of any will, or truth which BECOMES, and BECOMES by an act or acts of same will. In the absolute and necessary truths which lie within the cognizance of our finite mind, and in the relatively necessary truths which we discover in the established constitution of creation, we have the proximate standard by which reason, as a constituent of conscience, intuitively determines our actions to be right, or wrong, or indifferent.

We may now in a few words point out the ultimate standard of rectitude. By the necessary laws of thought, we must conceive all truth reducible to the two abovementioned classes,—*truth which* IS *without will, and truth which* BECOMES *by will.* The former is logically antecedent to the latter, and possesses an absolute certitude, and therefore must be the immutable, ultimate term by which the rectitude of the latter is determined. We must conceive of a time when only necessary, absolute truth really existed. To the divine, infinite thought, there existed the necessary truths of

reason and the necessary self-existent perfections of the divine nature, and all the possible future acts of His omnipotent will. Those acts of will in themselves possess nothing to determine their rectitude; for all possible acts of will are alike, the exertion of mere causative power. How then could the rectitude of the possible acts of the divine will be determined? Manifestly not by their being acts of will, but by their being acts of will causing something to be, in agreement with the antecedent, absolute truths of divine reason, and with the self-existent perfections of the divine nature. Hence the ultimate standard and foundation of rectitude to the divine will consists in those truths of divine reason, and those verities of the divine nature which will never produces and cannot change, but must in all its acts pre-suppose, and according to which its rectitude must be determined. Every intermediate standard of rectitude, whether in the form of the general constitution and government of creation or in the form of a law expressly specifying particular actions, must ultimately resolve itself into the immutable truths of divine reason, and the self-existent perfections of the divine nature. It follows, therefore, that a thing is not right because God wills it, but that God wills it because it is right; for the acts of divine will pre-supposes a standard above them in divine thought, and consequently are not primary or ultimate, but mediate as the signatures and manifestations of the necessary thoughts of the divine intelligence. The acts of the divine will, however, as the visible vestments of the divine thought and perfections, are an infallible and perfect, though mediate, standard of rectitude to the rational universe. It follows from this that as the ultimate and immutable standard of rectitude is contained in the necessary and eternal truths of divine thought,

so, whatever may be the intermediate standard of human rectitude, the proximate must be found in the contents of that part of man's nature which has its archetype in the divine intelligence and reason.

Conscience not only gives us the notion of right and wrong, it also involves a feeling of obligation to do that which, in our circumstances and relations we know to be right, and not to do that which we know to be wrong. This is a simple fact in our consciousness, and requires no proof. The man who is utterly incapable of feeling that he is under obligation to do what is right, or who cannot feel the "ought" of right, is not a moral agent. In order that the mind may feel the obligation or "ought" of rectitude, two conditions are requisite. First, the notion of right. When reason, as a constituent of conscience, discerns what act or acts of will affirm or harmonize with, the truth of the intelligence, it is at once evident, that relatively to these truths, those acts of will should be. From this recognition of the particular acts of will that should be, relatively to the truths resident in the intelligence, there springs up in the sensibility the correlated *feeling* of obligation. Secondly, before the feeling of obligation exists, there is required, in addition to our notion of right, the co-ordinate condition of consciousness of power and freedom of will, to do what is apprehended as right. Divest the mind of this consciousness of personal agency adequate to cause those actions which have been determined to be right, and even though we should suppose the notion of right to exist, the "ought" or obligation of right, could not, as a feeling, be developed. The paralytic man feels no obligation to rescue the drowning child, though he knows that such acts of benevolence are right. But he feels able to desire the child's safety, and

to call upon others to interpose for its deliverance, and he feels bound to exert himself thus far. When, therefore, the actions which are needed to affirm the truths of the intelligence are known, and when the notion of right blends with the consciousness of power to do it, the feeling of obligation is immediately developed; and nothing but the annihilation of this notion of right and the power to do it, can destroy the felt obligation of rectitude.

Conscience, still further, in its operations involves a feeling of moral approbation and disapprobation. The feeling of approbation and disapprobation is generic, and is excited by every object which is good or bad, useful or injurious. But when an object is viewed as right or wrong, a specific emotion of approbation or disapprobation is excited. To express the distinctiveness of the emotions excited by what is right or wrong, from the pleasure or pain arising from things merely beneficial or hurtful, we use the specific terms "moral approbation and disapprobation." These emotions presuppose a decision of the intelligence. They are designated approbation and disapprobation, because their objects have been tested in the crucible of thought, and having passed that ordeal, are transmitted as right, or wrong, to the sensibility, in which correspondent emotions arise. Thoughts concerning right and wrong are not thoughts about speculative matters which are cold and unaffecting; they produce lively emotions of complacency or displeasure. If we contemplate virtue, rectitude, and integrity in a man's character, we approve and delight in him; but the vicious, unjust, and deceitful man we dislike, — we turn from him with abhorrence. Even those who are themselves notorious for vice detect it in others, and admire those who exemplify virtues of which they them-

selves are destitute. The very pain which the contemplation of virtue in others sometimes produces in the vicious man, arises from his consciousness that he does not possess that which is excellent and worthy of praise.

Moral approbation and disapprobation are modified by their objects being our own selves, or others. In reference to ourselves, they assume the form of self-complacency and self-reproach. If we have performed what is right, and ought to have been done, there is, towards ourselves a complacency and satisfaction of the serenest nature. We feel worthy of ourselves. But if we act contrary to our convictions of what is right, and of what we ought to do, we feel degraded in our own esteem, condemned, and unworthy of ourselves. The feeling of self-complacency varies in degree, from a momentary pleasure, to a delight elevated and permanent. Self-reproach, on the other hand, varies from the slightest censure to the most pungent horrors of remorse. In reference to others who do what is right, our feeling of approbation unfolds itself in delight and admiration; we esteem them worthy of honor; but in reference to those who do what is wrong, our disapprobation shows itself in dislike, abhorrence, indignation, and wrath. Such is the correlated constitution of the sensibility to the intelligence, that right action gives pleasure, and wrong action excites displeasure; both emotions being modified in degree by the amount of right and wrong, and in kind by their relation to ourselves or to others.

According to the view we have given of conscience, it is a complex faculty. Its constituents are, an element of the intelligence and an element of the sensibility. In supplying us with the general notion of right and wrong, and in discriminating between them in particular cases, conscience

involves the exercise of reason; and in the feelings of obligation, moral approbation, and disapprobation, it contains a modification of the sensibility. While, in its constituents, conscience is identified with the intelligence and the feelings, yet, from its exercise being restricted to the one definite object of right and wrong, it possesses, in consciousness, a unity which invests it with a special character, and renders it impossible for us to confound its operations with the exercise of reason in speculative truth, or with the general emotions of the sensibility toward objects painful and pleasant. Though in philosophic precision conscience is a complex faculty, yet, from its objects being unique, it is popularly spoken of as a simple faculty. Indeed some eminent writers regard conscience as a simple, original faculty. But it seems to us unnecessary to postulate a distinct, simple, and original power of mind to account for our notion of rectitude and its correlated emotions. To our mind, reason appears as competent to recognize right and wrong, as it is to discover true and false; and as adequate to furnish the first principles of morals, as it is those of physical science and speculative philosophy. The difference is not in the faculty, or operation of mind, but in the object with which it is conversant. Reason must furnish the first truths and principles which constitute the fixed term by which the rectitude of actions is ascertained, and it must also determine the agreement or non-agreement of particular actions with its truths and principles. Moreover, in the ultimate analysis of right and wrong, we simply find the true and false in acts of will. There is, therefore, nothing in the true and false in thought, and the true and false in acts of will, to require a distinct original faculty to recognize them; for both lie in the same plane of thought. So, in the emotions ex-

cited by the idea of right and wrong, there is nothing to demand a separate faculty. The sensibility in general is, in its constitution, so correlated to the intelligence, that the emotions of the former correspond to the ideas of the latter. The feelings of obligation, approbation, disapprobation are the appropriate response of the sensibility to ideas of right and wrong. A lovely object, apprehended by the intelligence, is followed by an emotion of love, and a miserable object by one of compassion; so when an object is contemplated as right or wrong, there is an emotion of approbation or disapprobation. We do not, as we think, require to postulate a distinct, original faculty to account for the specific emotions excited by moral objects; but, to refer them as we do love, hatred, joy, sorrow, &c., to the same emotional nature, modified according to the character of the objects which the intelligence apprehends and presents.

In opposition to the view we have given of conscience as partly intellectual, and partly emotional, there are two theories, the one makes it altogether intellectual, and the other entirely emotional. It was our purpose to make some remarks on each theory, but space forbids; and if our theory be correct, the other two are denied by consciousness;—and to that highest of all authorities, for a sentence in our favor, we appeal.

It will suffice, in conclusion, to state briefly the relation of conscience to the will, and the entire mind. In the harmony of our mental constitution, conscience has a direct relation to the will, standing as it were next to it. Conscience is to the will, first, as a rule; secondly, as a law; thirdly, as a motive. As a rule, conscience exhibits the right and the wrong, and furnishes the method according to which the will is to conduct itself. As a law, conscience

enforces its exhibition of the method of conduct as obligatory; its rule is not a mere advice, it is a solemn and imperative "Thou shalt do right." As a motive, conscience constrains by its delights and benedictions, and restrains by its bitter remorse, and anathemas. From the direct or immediate relation of conscience to the will, it is indirectly or mediately related to the secondary exercises of the intelligence, and to all the states of the sensibility. The will is the executive in the mind. It has the immediate control and direction of the secondary exercise of the intelligence, and through these of all the emotions, desires, passions, and appetites. The intelligence and sensibility being thus far placed under the guidance and regulation of the will, conscience holds it responsible for their exercise and application being in accordance with what is right. Hence, mediately through the will, and as phenomena dependent on it, every secondary exercise and application of the intelligence, and every affection of the sensibility are related to conscience. Hence the moral character of mind. Hence the pervading sense of responsibility. Conscience erects an inward tribunal, and, sitting as a judge, it brings to trial thought, feeling, and volition. It pronounces upon each its august sentence; and it is indeed the prophetic type of Him who will by and by sit, and who is even now already sitting, on the great white throne, to execute judgment with equity upon individuals, and nations, and worlds.

AN ESSAY ON BAPTISM BASED ON ROM. 6, 3–4.*

BY S. SCHILLINGER.

That the apostle is speaking of baptism in the passage under consideration no one will undertake to dispute. Whether he is speaking of the *essentials*, *efficacy*, or *mode* of baptism are questions on which minds differ. That he refers to the *essentials* of baptism can scarcely be doubted, because the words: "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ," i. e., incorporated into Christ, also indicate that unless baptism be administered in His name there is no baptism. That he refers chiefly to the *efficacy* of baptism we do positively affirm. That he refers in the least to the *mode* of baptism we do most emphatically deny.† We shall endeavor to establish our position. God's Word and our Church's confessions say a great deal about the essentials and efficacy of baptism, but little or nothing do they say about the mode. When the Lord says, Matt. 28, 19: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," He teaches distinctly that baptism must be administered in the name of the holy Trinity. This is absolutely essential.

---

* Read before the Eastern Conference of the Northern District, and published by request of Conference.

† We agree with the author that Rom. 6, 3, treats of the efficacy of baptism; at the same time it is our opinion that the apostle speaks here of the efficacy of baptism in a figure borrowed from the then prevailing mode of baptizing. i. e. immersion. That immersion was originally the prevailing mode, can hardly be denied; nor do we see why we should hesitate to make this confession: the Baptists gain little or nothing by it, whilst many passages of Scripture—like the one discussed—will stand out in clearer and stronger light in consequence of it.—Ed.

When He says, John 3, 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," He teaches that baptism, which is a laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, Tit. 9, 5, must be administered with water, for there is where water and the Spirit come together. Water is another absolutely necessary essential to baptism. Scripture therefore distinctly teaches us that there can be no baptism without these two elements, viz: the Word and water. Our Confessions teach the same when they say: "Accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum: that is, when the word comes to the element or the natural object, it becomes a sacrament." (Book of Concord. N. M. Ed. p. 522.)

When, however, the Scriptures say: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," Mark 16, 16; "According to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior," Titus 9, 5–6; "Buried with Him in baptism wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead," Col. 2, 12; and when our Catechism says: "It effects the forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation upon all who believe it," they both speak of the efficacy of baptism. That the passage under consideration also refers to the efficacy, and chiefly to the efficacy, is clear from the entire context. In the preceding chapter the apostle sets forth the doctrine of justification by faith. He tells us that we were all dead in sin; that Christ died for us, and thus acquired a righteousness which He offers us as a free gift unto justification of life, and that therefore instead of sin which reigned unto death, grace now reigns through right-

eousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord; yea says he: "But where sin abounded grace did much more abound." Then he asks the question: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Then follows the passage under consideration which would remind us that all the benefits described in the foregoing chapter are secured by baptism into Christ and into His death through which these glorious blessings were gained. We are therefore not to continue in sin, for if we did, we would prove thereby that the old man was not yet crucified, and that we were not yet in possession of these gifts offered and sealed to the child of God by baptism into the death of his Savior. Being baptized we obtain faith in our blessed Savior, and come into possession of all that He accomplished by His innocent sufferings and death, and like as He died, we die also to the world and to sin, and like as He arose again from the dead so shall we arise also unto newness of life. Here the efficacy of baptism especially is set forth. Concerning this passage Luther writes: "Namely, not only that you were there washed and cleansed according to the soul, through the forgiveness of sins; but also that your flesh and blood be condemned and delivered to death, that it must be entirely drowned, *so that henceforth your life on earth may be a constant dying to sin.* For your baptism is nothing else than an act of grace, through which sin is destroyed, or drowned in you, in order that you may remain in grace, and not perish through sin under the wrath of God. Therefore, if you permit yourself to be baptized, you give yourself into the gracious drowning and merciful mortifying of self by your gracious God, and say: Drown me and mortify me, dear Lord, for I am willing from hence-

forth to be dead unto sin with Thy Son, so that through grace I may also live with Him.

But his declaration: "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death," and again: "We are buried with Him by baptism into death"—is spoken according to his Pauline manner, concerning the efficacy of baptism, which the death of Christ produces in it. For like as through His death He has paid for our sins, and thus has taken them away, that His death was a destroying and mortification of sin, so that it has no claim nor power over Him; so, too, have we, through His dying and death, the forgiveness of sins, and also die unto sin through the same power, so that it shall not condemn us, because we are baptized into Christ through which He imparts to us, and works in us that same power.

Yea, he further says, we are not only baptized into His death, but are also through the same baptism buried with Him into death; for through His death He also took our sin with Him into the grave, and entirely buried it, leaving it there; so that now to those who through baptism are in Him, it is to be and remain entirely destroyed and buried. But henceforth we are to live another life through His resurrection, through which we have by faith the victory over sin and death, and enjoy eternal righteousness and life." (W. St. Louis Ed. Vol. XII. pp. 761–62). From this citation we learn that the great Reformer's conception of this passage is that it sets forth the unspeakable efficacy of baptism. It is its efficacy above everything else that the apostle wants to inculcate into the hearts of the Romans. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death?" The revised edition, A. D. 1881, has it: "Or are ye ignorant that all we

who were baptized in Christ Jesus were baptized into His death?" The first words of this passage might be considered a reproof: Have you already forgotten, or is the matter of so little importance that you no longer remember that we all have been baptized, etc. "Were baptized into His death." The death He suffered upon the cross that we might be made partakers of His righteousness. We have the firm assurance that we are certainly made partakers of His righteousness and all the fruits of His death. We should then also be willing of to die daily unto sin and to suffer the cross, persecutions, martyrdom and everything, rather than sin wilfully and crucify anew the Son of God unto ourselves.

On the 3d verse of this passage *Besser* in his *Bibelstunden* comments as follows: "Know ye not," it is ignorance that deserves to be reproved, "that as many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ," and therefore on Christ's account are called Christians, just as on Adam's account we are called men, "were baptized into His death?" Being baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, we are baptized into Christ Jesus, because in Him the God-Man, our Mediator, all three persons of the holy Trinity work together in a three-fold love for our salvation . . . . Now we who are baptized into Christ Jesus are baptized into His death. His bloody suffering and death the Lord calls a baptism (Luke 12, 50) and as He was baptized in Jordan to fulfil all righteousness (Matt. 3, 15), so human nature whose burden of sin He took upon Himself must also die. He was baptized into our death, and we are baptized into His death . . . . Baptism gives us the power therefore to put on Christ (Gal. 3, 27) and works through His meritorious death redemption and justification, and signifies at the same time also that Christ puts us on, and lays

us into His death, "that the old Adam with all sinful lusts and affections should be drowned and destroyed by daily sorrow and repentance, and that a new man should daily arise that shall dwell in the presence of God in righteousness and purity forever." When a child is baptized there is as much done, as if I should say: I drown and destroy all that is flesh and blood in you and you are now without sin and misfortune. Therefore all that is worldly and fleshly must perish in baptism that the spirit alone may live." (Luther's W. Vol. III. p. 218*). Both justification and the forgiveness of sins, the renewing and taking away of the guilt of sin, are the effects of the washing of regeneration, i. e., of baptism, and they do not follow each other or go side by side, but they go in and with each other. It is that baptismal grace which clothes us with Christ's righteousness and places us into Christ's life and blessedness, that also chastises us and makes us hate sin, and through daily repentance executes the death sentence upon the old Adam that was pronounced against him in baptism. The baptismal testimonial of our faith is at the same time a covenant letter and bill of divorce. Christ joined Himself with us and joined us with Him; His blood washed us clean from sin and His Spirit sanctified us in the true faith; i. e, in the reception of grace and the gift of righteousness to life, we have signed a bill of divorce from sin, as is seen from the question asked the candidate for baptism: "Do you renounce the devil and all His ways and all his works?" This admonition of the apostle to Christians, that they shall no more be subject to sin, is found also in verse 12. Reminding us of our baptism he preaches Christ who was of God made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification, 1 Cor. 1, 30), and shows

* Quoted by Besser.

us the power of salvation in His justifying grace. Time and again he places before us the Gospel which reveals the righteousness that shall avail before God, and from that fountain of grace he draws all that is necessary for the Christian. We are baptized unto Christ's death, and we are also raised up into Christ's life. This is what the apostle sets before us by uniting our baptism with Christ's burial and resuscitation." (Bibelstunden on Romans, Vol I. pp. 367–370.

In the third verse the apostle tells us that we are baptized into Christ and therefore also into His death, so that all that Christ accomplished by His sufferings and death has been secured to us by baptism. In the fourth verse he tells us that Christ was buried also, and that He arose again from the dead, and therefore because we are baptized into Him and into His death, we are buried by baptism into death, and like as He was raised up by the glory of the Father, so shall we be raised up also, and walk in newness of life. That the death here spoken of is spiritual death, i. e., the death of the old Adam, which is finally completed in the separation of body and soul is seen clearly when we read verses 5, 6 and 7 in connection with the passage under consideration. Such is the effect of baptism that the old Adam is constantly being drowned and the new man comes forth and increases daily in newness of life. Parallel passages corrobarating this truth we find in Col. 1, 11–12, where it reads: "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." That the apostle is not speaking of temporal death and eternal

life when he says: "We are buried with Him by baptism into death," and "so we should also walk in newness of life," is evident also from the fact that the old Adam who is drowned and finally put to death in baptism shall no more be raised up, and that a new man shall come forth and walk in newness of life. Whilst it is true that Christ died bodily, was buried bodily and arose bodily, and all believers must die bodily, be buried bodily and arise bodily before the final goal is attained, yet this is not the death, burial and resurrection of which the apostle speaks here, because this bodily death, burial and ressurrection take place whether people are baptized and believe or not, but the death, burial and resurrection here meant cannot take place in those who despise and reject baptism. Only in the true believer, who makes use of the means of grace, is this dying, death and resurrection possible, and in him only is that newness of life possible. This dying and walking in newness of life continues throughout the Christian's entire career on earth. The old Adam is dying daily and the new man is daily arising in fulness. It works a great deal like a balance. As the one side goes down the other side goes up, and it is only by a constant use of the means of grace, the Word and sacraments, that the Christian is enabled to prevent the balance from working the wrong way and precipitating him into the abyss of eternal death. On the 4th verse *Besser* writes as follows: "It would be insufficient if we should say the watery grave (Flutgrab) of baptism (Comp. 1. Pet. 3, 21) is compared with the grace in which the body of our Lord that was nailed to the cross was laid. If we say and sing aright, that the baptismal water is to faith 'a crimsoned flood, with Jesus' blood,' then we will in the burial of baptism rightly understand the power of the buried and risen Christ." (*Bibelstunden* on Romans,

Vol. I. p. 370). *Luther* writes: "Wherefore this efficacy of the blood of Christ is also in baptism. This is the true caustic soap which not only removes the filth from the skin of the body, but it also eats through and frets and washes out the inward impurities, so that the heart becomes pure in the sight of God. Thus the blood of Christ is efficaciously mingled with water in baptism, so that it must no longer be received and regarded merely as simple water, but as tinged and colored with the precious blood of our dear Savior, Christ: so that it cannot in general be called a water bath, like that administered by Moses, or by a bath-keeper; but a healing baptism, or bath of blood which Christ the Son of God Himself alone has instituted through His own death." (W. St. Louis, Ed. Vol. XII. p. 538). *Besser* writes further: "We are buried with Him by baptism into His death (Col. 2, 12). On account of sin which has rendered our bodies mortal, Christ is buried for us, and through baptism in which the power of His death has laid hold of us, we have become before God buried members of our buried Head. Thus primarily, salvation is wrought that we are redeemed from the body of this death (chap. 7, 24), since its demand has been satisfied in the slain and buried body of Christ; secondarily, our having died unto sin which dwelt in our flesh is brought about and we are saved through our being buried with Christ, since this body of sin has been put away and lost its power in all who belong to Christ (v. 6). If we are called to mortify the deeds of the body (chap. 8, 13) and our members which are upon the earth (Col. 3, 5) then that is our baptismal call. What takes place in baptism permeates the entire life of the Christian." *Bibelstunden* on Romans Vol. I. pp. 370–371). *Luther*: "This entire life is nothing else than a spiritual baptism without intermission

until death, and he who is baptized is sentenced unto death. As though the priest said when he baptized: behold, you are a sinful flesh, therefore I drown you in the name of God and likewise sentence you in His name that with you all your sins may die and be destroyed. And the sooner a man dies after he is baptized, the sooner will his baptism be accomplished, for sin will not cease entirely as long as the body lives, which has been altogether so conceived in sin that sin is natural to it . . . . Therefore the Christian's life is nothing else than a beginning to die blessedly from baptism to the grave, for God would make him different from the beginning to the final judgment day." (W. St. Louis Ed. Vol. X. p. 2115). *Luther* again: "Thus we still lie in the grave with Christ according to the flesh; so that having the forgiveness of sins, we are children of God and are saved; still this is not manifest to our eyes and senses, nor to the eyes and senses of the world, but it is hidden in Christ through faith and covered until the last day. For no such righteousness, holiness, life and salvation appear and are experienced as are taught by the Word and as faith must apprehend." (W. St. Louis Ed. Vol. XII. p. 762).

Besser further: "As Christ however did not remain in death and in the grave, but gloriously arose, so shall we also be buried with Him through baptism that we may arise again spiritually and finally bodily. 'That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' The power of God through which Christ was raised from the dead and mightily showed himself to be the Son of God, reveals the glory of the Father, His Father and our Father (John 20, 17), a glory whose resplendence shines from Christ upon all His brethren (Eph. 1, 19, 20). When the Lord appeared to

His disciples after the resurrection the glory of the Father had removed all the painful and sorrowful demeanor, yea the entire resemblance of sinful flesh (Chap. 8, 9,) to such a measure that His followers did not at once recognize Him. A similar change takes place with every one that is baptized. Being risen with Christ from the baptismal grave (Col. 2, 12–31), we are, before God and all the holy angels, purged, purified, and washed from all guilt, and clothed in the righteousness, innocence, and blessedness of our Lord Jesus Christ. Of course the life and blessedness of Christians between their resurrection from the baptismal grave and their resurrection from the earthly grave, being hidden with Christ in God (Col. 3, 3), can be known and comprehended by faith alone. It is however no ficticious and imaginary life, but rather a most sure life, in comparison with which all the substance of this world is a mere appearance and shadow; for just as certain as Christ lives, and is no more subject to the reign of death, but rules as the Prince of life and Head of the living, so certain has life also begun in those baptized in Him. This is what Paul testifies when he says of the efficacy of baptism in the risen Lord: "even so we also should walk in newness of life." The old Adam walks in death, having fallen from the fellowship with God; and now that he is buried and raked under, the new man, risen in Christ, may venture to walk in life, God being his God, the food and power of his life, and his ruler and protector in his pilgrimage (v. 11). The sanctifying power of the Spirit that has wedded us through baptism with Christ, that we may bring fruits unto God (Chap. 7, 4), is engaged in nourishing and providing for the new life, and in supplying our journey with living fruits as followers of Christ. In the 12th chapter the Apostle shows us the manner of

the new life with its manifold fruits, in as much as he there places opposite each other the picture of light and the dark picture of heathendom and Judaism as represented in the 1st and 2d chapters. Here he fixes the eye and heart upon the brooklet, being planted at which, the holy children grow like the roses and bloom like the lilies, and send forth their savours of sweet odours (Sir. 39, 17–18)." (*Bibelstunden* on Romans, Vol. I pp. 372–373).

One more citation from *Luther*, and we are done with the efficacy of baptism to which the passage under consideration chiefly alludes as we affirmed in the beginning. He writes: "Thus St. Paul shows by these words, both what is effected and signified by the burial of Christ, and that we are buried with Christ. For in the first place Christ is buried in order that, through forgiveness, He might bury and destroy our sins in His grave, both those which we have committed and those which yet remain in our flesh and blood, so that they cannot make us guilty nor condemn us; in the next place, that He may also mortify the flesh and blood with all its remaining sinful lusts, through the Holy Ghost; so that they may not reign but be subject to the Spirit, until we are entirely freed from them." (W. St. Louis Ed. Vol. XII, p. 762).

We would now be done with our considerations also, had not Conference especially instructed us not to forget to ventilate the claim of immersionists that this passage has express reference to dipping. It shall not be our object here to endeavor to establish sprinkling over against dipping, but to show what we affirmed in the outset, that this passage has no reference whatever to the mode of baptism.

This is evident from the fact that the baptism here spoken of, as has been shown already, continues from the

time of our regeneration, or being baptized into Christ, until our bodies and souls are separated, or until temporal death. If immersionists were consistent with their claim in regard to this passage they would have to remain under the water from the first time they were immersed until temporal life became extinct, which would indeed not be very long. We arrive at this conclusion because the Apostle says: "We are buried with Him" (Christ) "by baptism into death." Now when a burial takes place, whether temporal or spiritual, that which is buried remains buried until the final day of resuscitation. If immersion is to represent *burial*, then why don't they leave them under? The death and resuscitation however here alluded to are a spiritual death, or the death of the old Adam, and resuscitation of the new man, therefore the burial must also be a spiritual burial. We dare not make the divine record here teach a spiritual death and resurrection and the burial a physical plunging under the water. Immersionists in claiming this passage as their strongest proof involve themselves in another inextricable difficulty. It is said here, by the glory of the Father Christ was raised up and by the same glory we shall rise into a new life, but it is by an altogether different power that the candidates for baptism are raised from the troubled water when they are immersed.—The true meaning is not that we are immersed or sprinkled into Christ and thus buried with Him by baptism into death, but that baptism, whether by immersion, or sprinkling, destroys our corrupt nature, the old Adam, and buries him, and brings forth the new man to a new life. Any one reading this passage with an unbiased mind will neither think of immersion nor sprinkling because there is not the faintest idea of either here expressed. If, e. g., we take the catechism and read: "Which are the

benefits of Baptism? It causes the forgiveness of sin, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation to those that believe: as the word and promise of God declare," who would think of the *mode* of administering the sacrament of baptism? The difficulty with immersionists is, that they go to God's Word with preconceived ideas and think they must find them there established, instead of going there first to get the real meaning of the Holy Spirit; and hence their fearful distortions and mutilations, and jumping at wild conclusions. They read their views into the Word of God, and the Word must suffer violence to be made to agree with them. This is the way they try to make it appear as though the passage under consideration proved their particular mode, although there is not a shadow of proof there. *Conybeare* and *Howson*, in their "Life and Travels of St. Paul," seem to think that when the Apostle wrote this passage he had in his mind the plunging under and raising out of the water all who would be truly baptized into Christ's death; for they have the audacity to render the passage thus: "Or have ye forgotten that all of us, when we were baptized into fellowship with Christ Jesus, were baptized into fellowship with His death: With Him therefore we were buried by baptism wherein we shared His death, (when we sank beneath the waters and were raised from under them,) &c. And then in a foot-note they say: "This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." (Vol. II, p. 169.) It is needless to show at any length that they have added a number of words to the original text to establish their pet notion of the mode of baptism. The same authors in the first volume, p. 439, in speaking of baptism, say: "It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in

exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates), has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture." Here although they admit, but lament the fact that there were exceptional cases of sprinkling or pouring, yet they insist that a plunging under the water was necessary to represent the death of the candidate's life unto sin, and then raising out of the water to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. But what of the exceptional cases? How is it about their death to the life of sin and resurrection to the life of righteousness? Will *Conybeare* and *Howson* consign them to perdition because they were not immersed? Our beloved *Starke* seems also to have entertained the idea of immersion in connection with this passage; for on the words: "Buried with him by baptism," he comments: "That we were dipped entirely under the water." (*Synopsis*, Vol. II. p. 808). Now we do not pretend to dispute that baptism was administered to a great extent in the primitive Church by immersion. Church history corroborates this fact. But does the water represent the death, and immersion the burial that take place in baptism? and is this what the Apostle had in his mind when he wrote this passage as *Conybeare* and *Howson* claim? These are questions that we cannot answer affirmatively. Is it not much more clear from the context that the death and burial which take place in baptism and of which the Apostle here speaks, do not represent at all, but are a real death of the old Adam, and a constant burial of the old fellow inch by inch as long as the Christian dwells on earth?

If this death and burial by baptism refer to the mode and to the mode chiefly as immersionists claim, then may we not rightly conclude that every one who is immersed must die unto sin and rise unto righteousness? We find this not to be the case however, for many fall away again and crucify anew the Son of God unto themselves. In order to establish immersion by this passage it would have to read: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were immersed into Jesus Christ were immersed into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by immersion into death." Just as the sacred writers elsewhere when speaking of baptism do not want to impress upon the hearts of the people the particular mode, but the nature and efficacy of baptism, so here the Apostle speaks not of its mode, but of its efficacy. E. g. we do not read Matt. 3. 1, "In those days came John" the sprinkler, or pourer, or dipper, or immerser, but "John the baptist." We do not read Matt. 3. 11, "I indeed" sprinkle, or pour, or dip, or immerse, "you with water unto repentance," but "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance." Nor do we read in the same verse: "He shall" sprinkle, or pour, or dip, or immerse you, but, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." We do not read Matt. 28, 19, "Go ye therefore, teach all nations," sprinkling, pouring, dipping, or immersing them, but "baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." We do not read, "He that believeth and is" immersed, dipped, sprinkled or poured, but "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," Mark 16, 16. Peter does not say: Repent and be sprinkled, or poured, or dipped, or immersed, but "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts

2, 28. In the same chapter we are told that about 3000 souls were added unto the Church, not by sprinkling, pouring, dipping or immersion, but by baptism. We do not read that the children of Israel were all dipped, sprinkled, poured, or immersed unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, but they "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." 1 Cor. 10. 2. We might remark here by the way, that the children of Israel were not immersed, but baptized, the Egpptians however were not baptized, but immersed.

It is a gross misapplication of the passage under consideration when, looking over its vital import, it is used to bolster up a lost cause in regard to the mode of baptism. The sainted Dr. *Greenwald*, after giving an excellent exegesis of the passage, has the following to say about the pet notion of immersionists: "*We read of being buried with Christ by baptism. Does this mean immersion?* The passage that is mainly relied on by the advocates of immersion is found Rom. 6, 3–6. Now this passage is sadly misconstrued, when it is taken to teach the mode of baptism, and immersion is that mode. It refers wholly to the gracious effects of Christian baptism upon the heart and life of its subject and not at all to the mode . . . . How practical, convincing and beautiful is the apostle's reasoning here, in teaching the gracious efficacy of baptism by which its subjects are made holy, and by which he proves that grace gives no countenance to sin. But how pitiful is the reasoning, and what a sad perversion of its original grand design, when in order to bolster up the false notion of dipping the body into water it is violently twisted to this low partisan purpose! It is a painful falling—we may say plunging—down from the grand height of the apostle's argument. There is no reference whatever to immersion in it. Understood as teaching the

sanctifying effects of Christian baptism upon the heart and life of the subject, it is one of the most precious passages of St. Paul's Epistles, and presents us with one of the finest specimens of his close and powerful reasoning. But the wresting of it to serve as an argument for plunging the body into water, in the interest of narrow sectarianism, is a mournful evidence of zeal without knowledge, and a reprehensible misapplication of the good Word of God." Greenwald's tract; "*Sprinkling the true Mode of Baptism*," page 50. The same author quotes as follows from Dr. Seiss' book "*The Baptist System Examined*": "In these words we have a sublime description of the wonderful efficacy of the Gospel upon the inner being of the believers, and of a condition of things resulting from their oneness with Christ, which amounts to an actual reproduction of His crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection, in the experiences of their hearts. But sublime and spiritual as these Scriptures are, the attempt has been made to harness them down as the mere dray-horses to drag out of the mire a hopeless sectarian cause. This so robs them of their literal force and meaning as to present them as the offspring of a luxuriant poetic imagination, employed upon remote resemblances of a point of external ceremony, as the mere intellectual play of fancy, fond of teaching faint analogies and of amusing itself with alliterations.

"According to our estimation of the type of Paul's mind and of the connection and import of these passages, they are the words of a man of God laboring to express some of the profoundest mysteries of the transforming power of the Savior's grace. He speaks neither of immersion nor effusion, nor of any mode of performing an external right, but the inner purification of man's whole moral nature by incor-

poration with Jesus Christ. The crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection to which he alludes, so far from being mere images of immersion and emersion, are literal terms denoting realities, and pointing not to a figurative, but to an actual death of every believer to his sins, and his real resurrection to newness of life. The cross here is not the cross of going under the water, but the inward crucifixion of the old man with the crucifixion of Christ. The parallel in the apostle's mind is not between the outward mode of external baptism and the death, burial and resurrection of the Savior, but between these particulars of His passion and the inward spiritual experiences of those who truly are His. His object is to show not that Christians ought to walk in newness of life because figuratively raised from a watery grave in an actual ceremony, but that justification by faith, so far from ministering to licentiousness, carries with it and effects in the soul an extinction of man's licentious and sinful being, and sets up in its place a new and holy creature; that it actually transfers to the believer's heart the whole history of the Savior's passion, and continues it there as a thing now transpiring in the hidden experiences of every true disciple. The contrary interpretation takes in about as much of the real sublimity of these passages as the stupid traveler at Rome took in of the grandness of the Coliseum by examining a detached piece of mortar from its walls.

"But if we were even to admit the contrary interpretation and agree that Paul is here tracing a comparison between the mode of baptism and the crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection of Christ, then the apostle comes before us in the absurd position of attempting to run an analogy between things in no way analogous. There is no mode of baptism of which we ever heard which takes in, even in the remotest resemblance, the various facts of this part of the

Savior's history. Take the most favorable particulars, the burial and the resurrection. What resemblance is there between water, the softest and most yielding of visible substances, and a solid rock, the very image of durability? What likeness between dipping a man in a fluid, and depositing a dead body in a horizontal excavation in the breast of a declivity? What similarity between the wading of a living man into a stream or cistern, and the bearing of a corpse to its final resting place? What analogy between the hasty lifting of a strangling subject from a plunge into the water, and the triumphant resurrection of the reanimated Jesus in the strength of His own omnipotence? What similarity between the glorified body of the rising Savior, and the drowning and dripping aspect of the immersed subject coming up from his immersion? Could anything be more unlike than Christ leaving His grave-clothes in His sepulchre of rock, and coming forth unaided in His incorruptible body, and a man lifted hastily from the water, the same clothing sticking sadly to him, and he looking a great deal worse than before his immersion? Is it not amazing that any human mind could have imagined that such a "sorry sight" bore any resemblance to the majestic and glorious resurrection of our blessed Lord?

"But, again, what the apostle in verses 3 and 4 calls baptism into Christ, into his death and burial (not in baptism but) *into death* by baptism, in verse 5 he calls *planting in the likeness of Christ's death.* But what resemblance is that between immersion and planting in *the likeness* of Christ's death? Was He put to death by drowning? He was not thrust down in the water, but lifted up upon the cross. He did not die by being gently sunk into a yielding fluid, but by being violently nailed upon an unyielding stake. Neither is immersion in water a representation of the idea of

planting. What similitude is there between the dripping, soiled, uncomfortable-looking man, lifted by another from the troubled water, and the beautiful young plant, painted by the rays and freshened by the showers of heaven, rising imperceptibly and noiselessly by the power of an inward life and vigor? If burial in Christ's death by baptism, then, is the same as planting in the likeness of Christ's death, as the setting of the scion of the new spiritual man by the crucifixion of the old, is it not as clear as language can make it that the idea of immersion is entirely excluded?

"Once more, the burial spoken of in these passages is not a burial in baptism, but a burial *in Christ's death.* Will language tolerate the idea of immersion in the death of another? Was Christ's crucifixion a fluid? There is *purification* in Christ's death; and by that purification the old man with his vestment of vices is *buried with Christ* never to rise again. But immersion in Christ's death, and that in the *manner* or *likeness* of that death (i. e., in a way resembling crucifixion) is an association of incoherencies that may be comprehensible to a Carolina lawyer, but surely not to common sense.

"Let us not be carried away then, as too many have been, by the mere sound of words. The burial of which the apostle speaks is not a mere figurative, but a literal and real burial, an actual obstruction and concealment of it in the deep abyss of eternal sepulture. There is not one of all these allusions that sustains the immersionist theory;—no just laws of exegesis will permit them to be thus tied down to the signification of mere mode. They prove that baptism is a sanctification, but they do not prove that it is *immersion,* or that immersion has anything to do with it." (Baptist System Examined, pp. 243–248.)

THE ERRORS OF JUDAISM IN CHRIST'S DAY.

Nothing is more evident from the pages of the New Testament than that there exists a deep chasm between Christ and the contemporary leaders of thought. On the face of matter this seems strange. For Christ came to fulfil the Law, and His life, character and deeds were exactly what, according to prophetic prediction, the Messiah was to be and do. And yet the men that sat on Moses' seat and themselves claimed to be and were recognized as the interpreters and guardians of God's revelation to Israel would not recognize Him. They found themselves in a hopeless antagonism to the very fundamental idea of the gospel He proclaimed. The fundamental differences were essentially three in number, yet they stood in close logical, historical and organic connection. They taught, first of all, a false doctrine of the law, the figment of self-righteousness through legal obedience; secondly, a kingdom of God which was carnal in character; and, thirdly, a Messiah who would satisfy these carnal hopes.

But one explanation can be given of this peculiar status. It is this, that in the four centuries of silence which intervened between the close of the Old Testament revelation and the beginning of the New, there must have been in Israel a lamentable departure from the old paths of faith as proclaimed by Moses and the prophets. To learn whether this is so or not, we cannot have recourse to the revealed Word; for this is silent on this subject. But there has been preserved quite a body of secular Jewish literature, written in the inter-Testament period. By examining this, we have ample data to see the working of the causes that lead to such sad results and managed to estrange Israel from the words of

revelation. The earliest indications are found already in the so-called Apocrypha of the Greek Bible (generally omitted in the English translations, but often found in German editions). The books of the Maccabees is emphatically nomistic in character, i. e., teaches the doctrine of legal righteousness. Another good illustration of the growth of this false doctrine is the Book of the Son of Sirach, which is generally placed at about 200 B. C. This work is not only thoroughly legalistic in spirit, but seeks, after the manner of the popular "Proverb" literature of the East to apply this principle to the work and duties of every day life. The author regards piety as equivalent to obedience to the law. They are identical and interchangeable ideas. The truly wise man is he who in his life carries out the precepts of the law. The author accordingly furnishes almost an endless list of rules for the conduct of life in accordance with this principle. He has rules for men in joy and wisdom, in good fortune and in misfortune, in poverty and in riches, in health and in sickness, in trouble and in trials; rules for the transaction of business, for dealings with friends, with high and low, with rich and poor, with good and bad, with the wise and the foolish; rules for work and business, for home and family, for the education of children, for the management of male and female servants, for the conduct toward one's wife, and so on almost *ad infinitum.* As a thesaurus of the minutiae of duties and corresponding regulations, the book of Jesus Sirach is almost equal to the Talmudists of later centuries.

In other works of this period a similar standpoint is taken. It is not always stated thetically as this is, for instance, not done in Tobit or Judith. But we do not know of a single Jewish writing of that period, not even those

under the influence more or less of Hellenistic thought, as are the works of the philosopher Philo, who endeavored by an allegorical interpretation of the law and the Old Testament history to make these palatable to Greek Platonists, or as Josephus, who attempted the same scheme for Israel's history, which does not presuppose the acceptance of the nomistic principle as the cardinal and central thought of the Jewish religion. Indeed it in the course of time became a matter that no longer required proof or defence. But further direct testimony on this point can be had in abundance. It is to be regretted that the collection of twelve books, written in Homeric hexameters, and known as the Sibylline Books, have been interpolated so much by later Christian writers that but small portions of them can with critical safety be used to illustrate Jewish thought before the days of the New Testament. But the investigations of Bleek, who ascribes Book III. 97–807 to a Jewish author of 160 or 140 B. C., have found general acceptance among scholars, and internal evidence fully justifies this acceptance. It is true that the chief interest of this section, which unfolds to the Jewish eye the panorama of a grand future, lies in the general description of these glories and the Messiah as king shall rule then, but for our purpose it is of interest to note that the essential characteristic of this kingdom shall be the absolute sway of the law over the people. Lines 755–758 read thus:

"And to the end of time one king will be the friend of the other and according to one law all the people of the earth will be governed by the Lord in the starry heavens for all the deeds done by mortal man.."

Entirely similar is the standpoint of the Psalms of Solomon, a collection of eighteen odes, lyrical in character,

not written metrically but composed in the form of *parallelismus membrorum*, and written according to the agreement of investigators shortly after the entrance of Pompey into Jerusalem. This collection is also interesting chiefly for its ideal of the Messiah who is to come, but is instructive also for its underlying ideas of legal righteousness. Pharisaically the doctrine is that both reward and punishment are meeted out juridically according to works (17, 9–12), that righteousness is a righteousness of deeds, (14, 1,). The fate of a man after death is entirely dependent upon his deeds in life. He has free choice to select the good or the evil, and thus to determine his own fate. If he chooses the good, he will arise to eternal life (3, 6); if the latter he will be eternally lost (13, 9, sqq.; 14, 2 sqq.; 15) The *summa summarum* of his theology we have probably best in his words 9, 9.:

"He that does righteously treasures up eternal life to himself. But he that does unrighteously causes the ruin of his soul."

Schuerer (p. 832) correctly says: "The spirit of these psalms are out and out that of pharisaical Judaism. In their final expression an earnest and moral sentiment and a pronounced piety. But the righteousness which they preach and the absence of which they lament consists entirely in the fulfilment of the Pharisaic commands."

It would not be in accordance with the principles of literary criticism to use in this connection any of the technically so-called legal literature of later Judaism, since the Mishna and its Palestinian and Babylonian commentaries in the Talmuds, as also the Midrashim and the Aramaic paraphrases of the law, the Targunuim were all collected and put in their present shape after the days of Christ.

Possibly some of the dicta of the *Pirke Aboth*, the ethical tractate of the Mishna, could be used here, particularly as a large number of them are given as the sayings of the fathers who lived before the New Testament era. The roots, however, of this whole class of literature go up to the pre-Christian period, and their spirit can be accepted as the spirit that inspired the teachings of Christ's contemporaries. Later Judaism only built upon this foundation.

Out of the establishment of monocracy in Israel grew consistently and logically the carnal and worldly conception of the idea and character of the kingdom of God. Essentially the latter controls the former error, but the latter comes as a conscious factor into Israel's religious development after the other, however much it may have unconsciously contributed to legalism. At any rate it is chiefly in the later literature that we learn how Israel commenced to long for a kingdom of this world and had forgotten her spiritual mission in Israel. Not until after the Moslem struggle do we meet with such carnal perversions of prophetic hopes and promises. Its orgin at this time is easily understood. Israel had been disappointed. It had adhered to the law even at the sacrifice of much blood. It did not seem to harmonize with the promises of God that a faithful people should suffer. They thought they had reasons to expect a better fate. Thus in Enoch 103, 11 the pseudo prophet complains: "We hoped to be the head, but we became the tail, and the unrighteous have made their yoke heavy for us." If the faithful were not to become faint and to despair in their allegiance to God and His law, it was necessary to direct their minds to the rewards in store for them. The terrible present had only woe and death; but the future would bring to Israel recompense and reward for all the tribulations endured

for their righteous cause. When the times were so gloomy, pseudo-prophets, under the name of pious fathers, such as Enoch, Noah, Moses, Baruch, proclaimed to the people a future that would be the exact counterpart of the present, namely, the rule of the righteous, i. e., those who obeyed the laws of God over the sinners. They seize upon the declarations of the real prophets which would seemingly answer their purposes and fill out what seemed necessary to complete the picture. In this way Israel's religion became a religion of hope and this hope became carnal, because the present woes, in connection with superficial legal ideas, suggested such hopes as the most desirable counterpart of the present. This was the occasion and these are the underlying thoughts of the so-called Apocalypses, prophetic pseudopigrapha, as they are usually called by scholars. The leading writings in this line are the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Apocalyps of Baruch, and in a later date the fourth book of Ezra, the Testament of the XII. Patriarchs. It is not strange that these apocalypses have been properly esteemed as indicative of the various phases in the development of Jewish thought and in their influence in molding this thought.

Without doubt the best among the apocalypses is the Book of Enoch. As at present constituted it is composed of two large divisions and one or more smaller additions. The groundwork consists of c. 1–36 and 72–105, and c. 37–70 are the so-called Parables, while 54, 7–35, 2; 69: 65–69, 25; 106–107 constitute the so-called Noachic fragments, or renditions to Noah. The groundwork is a fruit of the bitter days of persecution by the rabid Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, 175 B. C., and is thus a Maccabean production. The sufferings of the present suggest the character of the Messianic

rule for the faithful. It begins by a judgment upon the wicked angels and men, for it was a popular idea at that time to ascribe a great deal of the evil to angels and to Satan, chiefly on the basis of Gen. 6. This judgment is described is being carried out by God Himself (1, 9; 90, 20; 91, 7; 100, 4), but the agents shall be both the good angels and the faithful of God, whose horses shall wade in the blood of their adversaries up to their bellies. The punishment of the wicked is described as burning in hell (10, 14; 10, 6; 90, 24; 99, 11), and shall be eternal (5, 5, 6; 10, 12, 12, 4. 5; 22, 11, seq). Then the rule of the just shall begin. What the faithful lacked before and desired so much, this they will now receive. The blessings of the Messianic times are both physical and moral, i. e. moral understood from a legalistic standpoint. They enjoy the good of the land (10, 18. 19); a new temple will be built and the old one removed (90, 28. 29); around it shall gather all the saints from the Diaspora (90, 33); they shall eat of the tree of life (24, 4. 5) which has been transplanted to Jerusalem; they will have wisdom (5, 8; 91, 10) and will be morally perfect, i. e., will not violate a law (5, 8; 92, 5); this condition of affairs shall endure forever (91, 17; 92, 4; 105, 2); in these glories the risen just, those who were slain on account of their fidelity, shall take part (103, 4; 91, 10; 92, 3). Particularly are chaptere 99 and 100 interesting in showing that justice and punishment here pictured is purely retributive in character. "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" is the author's ideal. The good are rewarded because they have been faithful; the wicked are punished because they did not obey and persecuted those who were willing to obey the law. Cf. 103, 7 sqq. Only after all this has been done is mention made of a Messiah, and then He is merely a figure-head. Cf. 90, 37. 38.

The central idea of the prophecy is the destruction of Israel's enemies and the establishment of a powerful earthly kingdom with Jerusalem a center.

The same in general character but materially differing in detail according to the needs and the suggestions of the hour, are the Messianic pictures presented by other works of this period. In the majority of these this personal Messiah is considered of greater importance than is the case in the first part of the Book of Enoch, but no where is He of the importance which Scriptures assign to Him. It seemed that the writers of that day scarcely knew what to do with the Messianic predictions of the old prophets. The latter emphasized His work as all important; the Evangelist of the Old Testament (Is. 53) describes Him almost as an historian world; yet in the popular views of the day such a Messiah was not needed and was not wanted. They accordingly seize upon the outward features of these predictions and develop these to suit their systems and their times. The highest ethical idea of a Messiah in this literature, at least as far as this person is concerned, is that of the Parables of Enoch. Their date is uncertain, though they are doubtless purely Jewish character. Here even pre-existence is declared of His person (48, 3. 6). His functions are those of a judge who decides strictly according to the Word of God and who will be a teacher of true divine wisdom. He is the wisest of the wise and will free His people of their false wisdom. Then He will judge the world and establish His kingdom. Jerusalem shall be the center and the people's glory shall be the supremacy over their enemies, although the ethical blessings, i. e. full sway of the law or freedom from sin, for, according to the views of the author, these two are identical, are more strongly emphasized than the temporal and worldly.

But the idea, as such, fits well into the Jewish surroundings and thoughts of the times.

Of the Apocalypse of Moses, cited frequently by the Church fathers, portions have but recently been recovered in a Latin translation. Internal evidence points to the fact that the woes of Israel under the Roman supremacy of Varus (4 B. C.) furnishes the historical background and occasion of this *pia fraus*. It describes the Messianic era in this way: Preceding its advent Satan will have an end. The Celestial One (the Messiah) will arise from His seat of government and will come out of His holy place in indignation and ire on account of His children. Earth and heaven will exhibit the signs of the last times. The moon will be changed to blood (Joel 2, 31) and the circuit of the stars will be destroyed. Then the nations of sin will be destroyed and the happy days for Israel shall begin. God will exalt them and make them cling to the starry heavens (*hærere cœlo stellarum*) and they will see the destruction of their enemies.

Both the Sibylline Books and the Psalms of Solomon are instructive for our object. Especially is this the case of the latter, which seem almost to have been the text book of the Pharisees of Christ's days. In these lyrics more than in any other book of the period is the kingly character of the Messiah emphasized. The deliverance from the sinners is expected through a powerful Son of David, the promised Messiah. The singer prays that this Son of David may soon come and cleanse Jerusalem of the heathen walking in iniquity. The Messiah's mission will be a double one. The sinners will first experience the fire of His wrath, and the saints the wisdom of His instruction; so that no longer the former will draw their swords against the children of righteousness, nor the latter be in danger of being misled. After

the removal of the unclean from Jerusalem the new rule shall be inaugurated, at the head of which will be the Son of David, sent for this purpose by God. The nations that have disregarded the law will flee from before His face, or will be destroyed; and then the saints will be gathered, even from the ends of the earth, and unrighteousness, i. e. disobedience to the law, will not be permitted to dwell in their midst. The Messiah will know them all and will divide the land among the different tribes. No stranger or foreigner will be allowed in this sacred congregation. The heathens, fearing this mighty King, will come and serve under His yoke, and they will bring as offerings to the King the weakened children of Israel, i. e. those in exile and in the dispersion. Israel is here everywhere the chosen people and the special object of God's goodness. They are "the first and only begotten children of God" (18, 4), the "child" of God (17, 27). The Israelites will inherit a powerful kingdom of this world under a mighty Messiah, and the other nations will be "drawers of water and hewers of stone" for the favored few.

In the Sibylline books we are told that when the proper time shall have arrived, "the nation of the mighty God will again become powerful" (3, 195). The Messianic age is described in full in Book 3, 652–794. God will send a king from the East, who will put an end to wars on the whole earth; He will destroy His enemies and keep His promise to His faithful ones. But this the new king will do in accordance with the commands of God, for He acts under divine direction. The people will be loaded with riches, with gold and silver; the earth and the sea will send forth their wealth. On seeing this the kings of the earth will assemble against Him and His country, but only to their own

destruction. They try to destroy the temple at Jerusalem and slay the faithful; they offer sacrifices to false gods around the city. While thus engaged the mighty voice of God will speak to them, and all will be destroyed by the hand of the Everlasting. Fiery swords will fall from heaven; burning torches appear; and the earth and the sea are disturbed by the hands of the Almighty. Erebus, the dark, will appear. The crevices of the rocks will be filled with dead bodies; blood will flow from the rocks; all the powerful enemies of the new kingdom will fall to the ground, because they have not acknowledgd the law. God will judge them by fire and the sword and great waters. Brimstone will fall from heaven; hail will descend; death will destroy all the quadrupeds. Then first will the ungodly begin to know the everlasting God and will lament exceedingly. They will bathe themselves in blood, and the earth will drink in the blood of the slain. After the removal of the wicked by the judgment of the sword, the reign of peace for the children of God commences. They will assemble around the temple of God in peace, thankful for their lot to the good Judge. There will then be no war, for the Everlasting is their help. The islands of the sea, i. e. the heathen nations, will say: "Up and let us fall down on the earth and worship the Everlasting King, God the Most High and Great; let us send to the temple; let us all consider the law of the Most High God. For it is best for us all to fall down and worship. But we had departed from the ways of the Everlasting and had honored the works of our own hands."

The prophetess continues with lines 743 by saying that then the earth will yield abundantly of all kinds of fruit, and all species of animals will be plenty; fountains will flow with milk, and the cities will be filled with good things.

Then, too, all the kings will be friends, and the Everlasting God will govern all mankind according to a common law. He will establish an everlasting kingdom (*βασιλήϊον εἰς αἰῶνας*) for all men, and all men will become God-fearing; and they will bring presents and frankincense to the house of God. This will be the only house in which worship will be held, and all mortals will call at the temple of God. The prophets will then put away the sword. God will dwell in Zion, and there will be everlasting peace.

Concerning the character of the Messiah, a somewhat younger portion of the vaticination says (3, 46–50): "And then when Rome shall govern Egypt also, and rule with it, then the greatest of kingdoms, that of the Everlasting King, shall appear on the earth, and a holy king (*ἁγνὸς ἄναξ*) will appear who will govern all the lands for all times or the times past." The Everlasting King is of course God Himself and the holy king is the Messiah.

With such sentiments, of which we have been able to give only a few characteristic examples here that could easily be increased three or four-fold, for spiritual food and drink, it is not surprising that the popular faith of Israelites when they became Jews, took the form and shape in which we find it resisting Christ's appeal to the law and the prophets. As an historical phenomenon it is capable of satisfactory explanation, however much we may regret that direful departure from Scriptural teachings. Israel lost her spiritual inheritance because they departed from the covenant conditions to which that inheritance was attached.

G. H. S.